

[25th July 1953]

THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Yes, Sir, it is a private concern.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Article 41 has nothing to do with this present lock-out. I rule this motion out of order. I am not going to allow any hon. Member to speak on this motion hereafter.”

(2) ASSIGNMENT OF LAND TO POLITICAL SUFFERERS.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I shall now take up the second adjournment motion. It is signed by seven hon. Members. This refers to ‘ assignment of land to political sufferers ’. The House may remember that yesterday there was a short-notice question on the same subject. A number of supplementary questions were put and they were answered. The House has already thus discussed that question. Moreover this is not a matter of urgent public importance. I therefore rule this motion also out of order.

“ We shall now take up the next item in the Agenda, viz., the Andhra State Bill. We are now in the Seventh Schedule.”

III.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE ANDHRA STATE BILL, 1953—*cont.*

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I wish to inform hon. Members that this Bill has been before us for the past 11 days including to-day. I suggest it would be better if we sit an hour or two late to-day and finish the Bill to-day itself. We may have night sittings.”

* **THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—**“ There is this difficulty for us, Sir. We come early morning at 8-30 and sit here till 1-30 p.m. Then we have again to sit from 4 p.m. and go on till 7 p.m. in the Council. Therefore it would be very difficult for us if we have night sittings. I do not think even hon. Members of this House would like to have night sittings. I would only request hon. Members to restrict rather than elaborate their discussions. Then only we can finish our discussion.”

* **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—**“ I just wish to add that I am having every day my own night sittings till 12 o'clock. Besides attending to legislative work, I have to attend to administrative duties also. The day-to-day work of Government has to go on. I have to devote a large part of the nights to official work and it is not possible for me to participate here in night sittings. Of course hon. Members can carry on but the Government would not be able to help in full measure. Further it is possible for hon. Members to be fairly quick in their arguments instead of repeating and even when a matter has been decided, go on reviewing. If we could not finish to-day and if it is found necessary, we will have to sit for a few more days. I have not the least objection. Let me not be misunderstood as though I am trying to shut out any views. I only thought that there was scope for greater speed.”

25th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER :—" Hon. Members should remember that we have besides this Andhra State Bill, six Government Bills."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" We hope to finish all those Bills in a day with the co-operation of leaders like Mr. Viswanatham and Mr. Nagi Reddi. All those Bills are non-controversial Bills. They are urgent Bills also. I do hope that Mr. Viswanatham, Mr. Nagi Reddi and others will go through the relevant clauses of those Bills even to-day so that it may facilitate those Bills being passed unanimously later on when we take them up."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" Even under clause 46, some of us have given notice of certain amendments. We would like to speak on those amendments. If the House has given a verdict on Mr. Viswanatham's amendment, it does not mean that other amendments are not to be taken up. Moreover our amendment covers a different ground."

" THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, I remember it was decided yesterday that as soon as Mr. Viswanatham's amendment was passed, it could be taken for granted that all other amendments would be deemed to have been withdrawn."

MR. SPEAKER :—" What has Mr. Viswanatham to say on this? "

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" So far as I am concerned, I thought when my amendment was carried yesterday that inasmuch as my amendment included within its scope the Seventh Schedule and inasmuch as the views expressed by hon. Members on the same on the floor of the House would be made available to the Expert Commission for whose appointment my amendment was mainly intended, all other amendments given notice of by hon. Members under the Seventh Schedule would be deemed to have been withdrawn. The Expert Commission would go into all the details connected with the division of assets and liabilities. But now hon. Members want to express their views on the various clauses of the Bill under the Seventh Schedule. That is quite a different matter, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" But hon. Members want their amendments even to be put to vote."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I only thought that they wanted to express their views. According to my knowledge I do not think they are anxious to have their amendments put to the vote of the House, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Do they want to move the amendments? "

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" But some hon. Members have given notice of amendments on different lines. There are two different types of amendments. One is that of Mr. Viswanatham which was carried yesterday. The others relate to the division of assets and liabilities on a population basis."

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [25th July 1953]

That is why some hon. Members want to speak on the same, Sir. If we close discussion on the same, then it amounts to depriving these members of the opportunity of speaking and expressing their views on their amendments, which cover a different ground from that of Mr. Viswanatham."

9-40 a.m. SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" The point is this, Sir. Of course, we will offer some remarks. That apart, there are two different types of amendments to clause 46."

MR. SPEAKER :—" What are those amendments? "

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Amendment No. 126, Sir."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" When it is claimed that such an amendment should be put here for discussion, is it the intention to put it to vote or is it the intention to merely talk about it? Now, if it is not the intention to put it to vote, there is no meaning in talking about it for this reason—of course, I do not want to shut out the discussion—either it is barred by the resolution previously passed or it will come when the discussion on the Schedule itself comes. It therefore need not be taken up separately and time spent on it."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, the point is this. Clause 46 has two sub-clauses. Here it is said that such an apportionment shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final. But, what is the kind of apportionment that is to be made? That is the question which has to be discussed."

MR. SPEAKER :—" There will be a repetition of arguments on this amendment. Anyhow I will allow it and put it to the vote of the House."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, the question is whether the apportionment should be in a particular way. There would be many other hon. Members who would be willing to speak because it is a very important matter."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I would now request Mr. Nagi Reddi to go through the amendment which has been, rightly or wrongly, accepted by the House yesterday, which reads as follows :—

' This House recommends the deletion of clause 46 and the insertion of a new clause in its place, providing for the apportionment of the assets and liabilities dealt with in the Seventh Schedule, as also of the current revenues and expenditure, between the States affected by this Act, by an Order of the President, on the recommendation of a neutral Commission of Experts, presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court.'

That means that clause 46 is intended to be deleted and the recommendations made in Amendment No. 114 are to come into effect. Therefore, whereas we may discuss the other principles, we cannot discuss clause 46, because it has been recommended to be deleted and a new clause inserted. Now, leaving alone clause 46, we have to take a decision whether the Seventh Schedule as such should be considered or not. My own view is that the Seventh

25th July 1953] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Schedule should be discussed and hon. Members may express their opinions on the various paragraphs, instead of wasting our time on clause 46 which has been recommended to be deleted by another new clause."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" The point that we discussed yesterday was about the provision to be made for apportionment of the assets and liabilities dealt with in the Seventh Schedule. My point is that a neutral Commission will have to go into the question of apportionment. The principles on which the neutral Commission will have to decide the question have to be discussed. If we are to hurry up"

MR. SPEAKER :—" We have spent five hours over this question yesterday."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" What principles should guide the neutral Commission to go into the whole question is a matter which was not discussed yesterday. The point is if I now speak, the opposition will certainly have to say something on their side. I would take my chance as one who has moved the amendment and I may be permitted to speak after those who support or oppose the motion have spoken."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" It is understood, Sir, that we are discussing amendment No. 126 and it will be put to the vote of the House."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, even though the House has recommended the appointment of a Finance Commission or an Expert Committee, that Committee which will be appointed by the President will have to be guided by certain principles in apportioning the assets and liabilities of the State. Now, Sir, if we go through the whole of the Seventh Schedule, we do not find any principle at all. If there is a principle at least to most of us it is incomprehensible. In order to substantiate this, I may cite one or two examples, Sir. If we take the cash balances in all the treasuries in the State, they are divided on the basis of population. But when it comes to a question of dividing the unissued stores, it is mentioned that they will be divided in proportion to the total indents for stores made in the three years immediately preceding the 1st April 1953. So we find there is no common principle involved in the proposed division. That is why I wish to submit that whether one loses or gains, we will have to base the apportionment on certain principles. Even in our society when a joint family is divided, we find that the division of assets and liabilities is based on the number of brothers that are in the family. When a State is divided into two, the same principle will have to be applied. If that is so, the entire assets and liabilities must be divided on the basic principle of population.

" To cite one or two more examples, the shares in the Travancore Fertilizers and Chemicals Limited and the Madras Radio and Electricals Limited are proposed to be divided on the basis of population. But the same population basis is not proposed to

9-50
a.m.

[Sri M. Hanumantha Rao] [25th July 1953]

be adopted for the division of the assets and liabilities of the State Trading Schemes. I am not speaking for any particular part of the State; I am speaking for the composite State of Madras as a whole. It is likely, if it is kept as it is, that every Member will be pleading for that which is advantageous to his State, and nobody will be pleading for a common principle. Hence evolving a common principle is most desirable, and that will avoid so many of the difficulties that have been pointed out in this House.

“ There is no common principle of division for the items in the Seventh Schedule; the principle differs from item to item. It is provided in the Schedule that the depreciation reserve funds shall belong to that State in which the concerns to which they relate are situated. For the projects or anicuts in the Andhra area, there is no depreciation fund at all. For example, the Krishna anicut is almost cracking and there is no depreciation fund for its reconstruction. But there are depreciation funds for schemes like the hydro-electric schemes which are constructed from the common funds of the entire State. If we accept population as the basis for dividing some assets, certainly we can apply that basis for all items of assets and liabilities. Hence our amendment proposes that the population basis should be adopted by the Commission of Experts that is going to be appointed.

“ In the sixth provision of the Seventh Schedule, it is said that the loans outstanding in an area within a State shall belong to the State in which the area is included. But at the same time, for division of pension liabilities, population basis is proposed. The service personnel coming from the Andhra area is only 15 per cent of the entire State personnel, and naturally the number of pensioners will be less in the Andhra State than in the residuary State. Though it will be a disadvantage to the Andhra Government to apply the population basis in this case, I support it because a common principle has got to be followed to ensure a proper division of assets and liabilities. Objections were raised on the ground that assets like hydro-electric schemes and projects cannot be divided on the basis of population. Hydro-electric schemes, projects and similar things cannot be physically removed from one State to the other. But their value can be taken into consideration and the apportionment made on the population basis by adjustment in the public debt or some such thing. So there is no substance in those objections.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Is it the hon. Member's suggestion that all the lands in the respective States should be valued, as that is how I understood him? ”

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—“ Lands are excluded. I referred to the hydro-electric schemes, projects and similar things in various parts of the State. What is excluded according to our conception is roads and buildings. Mr. Justice Wanchoo has recommended that a certain amount must be given to the Andhra State as a compensation for the comparatively less number of buildings in Andhra area. Since a separate formula is suggested in respect

25th July 1953] [Sri M. Hanumantha Rao]

of buildings, buildings also are excluded. The Hon. Finance Minister was interpreting the words 'all types of assets and liabilities, unissued stores, articles, goods' as to include every pin and ink bottle. We do not actually mean that. For buildings and other things, we have suggested another formula."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"What are those other things?"

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—"They are buildings, hospitals, educational institutions, medical college, engineering college, the equipment therein, etc. These properties are not included. For that, we suggested a different method of distribution. These are not to be divided on the basis of population. Mr. Justice Wanchoo has suggested the grant of Rs. 230 lakhs as compensation to be given by the residuary State. He has also suggested that Madras might be made the temporary capital of the Andhra State for some time to come. But the Communist party did not accept that suggestion. There is no question of having the Andhra State capital temporarily in Madras City. We argued and we stood by our stand that there was no meaning in having our temporary capital here. 'Let us go out', we said, so that there need not be any unnecessary strife at the time of partition. We have suggested that Rs. 4 crores be given to the Andhra State as compensation for the less number of buildings we have in Andhra area. If we keep in view that Mr. Wanchoo's suggestion of keeping the temporary capital here is not accepted then the amount we suggest is perfectly justified. We have so many handicaps to overcome. We have to go out of Madras, and construct our own buildings in our capital. It is a very difficult task. We will have to overcome very many odds in constructing such buildings. Even with this Rs. 4 crores, it will be impossible for us to construct all the required buildings in a new State. Mr. Justice Wanchoo recommended that Rs. 230 lakhs should be given. We say that at least Rs. 4 crores should be given to the Andhra State. This figure is accepted by all reasonable people who desire that the new State also must have some basis to prosper. The new State has to start as a partitioned member of a joint Hindu family. The partitioned member of a joint Hindu family has to start everything afresh, and he also has to prosper. So, what I mean to suggest is that all types of assets and liabilities, unissued stores, articles, goods, etc., mentioned in our amendment should be apportioned on a common basis. We do not want to apply the same principle to buildings, hospitals and educational institutions, since it will be dragging too far and since Mr. Wanchoo himself has separately dealt with them.

"Keeping all these things in view, we will have to see that our assets and liabilities are properly divided. It is the duty of all, not only of the Communist party and not only of the Andhras, but of all people who are seriously considering this question to come to an understanding about it, discuss it thoroughly and evolve a common principle on which our assets and liabilities are to be divided. There is no meaning in suggesting that the principle of

10
a.m.

[Sri M. Hanumantha Rao] [25th July 1953]

population should be applied to a particular thing and not to another. If at all we adopt the method suggested in the Seventh Schedule, certainly we will be going in for strife and unnecessary feelings. Hence, Sir, certain principles have got to be evolved. The most democratic principle and the most convenient principle, which cannot be twisted either this way or that way to suit one's own interests or to suit one item and not another item, is the principle suggested by us. If this principle is accepted, I am sure that even the financial commission or the expert committee that will be appointed to go into this (as recommended by this House yesterday) will come to their conclusions on the same basis. So, I commend our amendment for the acceptance of the House. I hope the Government would accept our proposal."

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—"Sir, I want to make a submission to you. I feel that this amendment is re-stating all that was said yesterday, and confusing the amendment that we passed yesterday. I think it is generally agreed to by all the people . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let not the hon. Member call it an amendment. It is only a resolution."

* SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—"The general principle that assets and liabilities should be divided on population basis is accepted by everybody and by Mr. Justice Wanchoo. The question is how this should be decided in relation to various other items."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Government of India will do all that."

* SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI:—"I feel, Sir, that we are confusing the amendment that we passed yesterday by discussing now the details given in the Seventh Schedule."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, we were very much concerned with the time required. We discussed the problem of order, procedure and desirability, and the Speaker took part in it. If the Speaker conceded to pressure, are we now to re-open the whole question of procedure?"

SRI C. V. K. RAO:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir . . ."

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY:—"Sir, we had a long discussion yesterday. The same matter is being discussed now."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is the hon. Member moving for closure?"

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY:—"Yes, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER:—"But I have one difficulty here. If the closure is accepted the Hon. Minister cannot reply. We must also hear the reply of the Hon. Minister."

25th July 1953]

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ Sir, the hon. Member Sri Venkatasubba Reddi raised some objection. My point relates to his objection. He said that we were re-stating all that had been said. No. We are only helping all that had already been said. Yesterday everything was discussed in regard to assets and liabilities and their apportionment. The House passed a resolution that a financial commission should be appointed. A suggestion is made as to the basis on which the expert committee may function. This is a democratic principle and a feasible proposition. When we are putting it to the Government that this is a feasible proposition, the Government need not run away from it. Any Member should appreciate our point of view. It is our duty and responsibility to let the expert committee know on what principles we apportion assets and liabilities. As my friend Mr. Hanumantha Rao has already pointed out, different methods are adopted for different purposes, e.g., loans, stores, other machinery, and so on and so forth. So a common principle has got to be adopted, and this common principle will not in any way confuse or burden the expert committee that will be appointed. I hope that the Government will take it up and recommend it to the Centre as a feasible proposition. After all, the Centre wants to be helped. So, if the Government here say that it cannot be done, we will only be confusing the Centre. We all wanted, by a majority vote yesterday, a special committee to be formed. Now the Government can come forward and say that the principle of division on the basis of population can be a feasible one. That way they can make a suggestion to the Centre. This is all I want to say, Sir.”

10-10
a.m.

SRI K. VARADACHARI :—“ On a point of order, Sir. The Resolution passed yesterday agreed to the appointment of an Expert Committee. If we are to prescribe the method by which this Committee should function”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have given a ruling on that and I have allowed the hon. Member to move his amendment. Let not Sri Varadachari re-open it.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ Sir, I do not like to go into the points that have already been raised by my hon. Friend Sri Hanumantha Rao. Now, if we go through the amendments, one thing will be very clear and that is that most of the amendments advocate the basis of population for division.”

SRI G. NAGABHUSHANAM :—“ On a point of order, Sir.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am not going to allow any points of order now.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ If one goes through the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Viswanatham (No. 177), one will find that he agrees to the principle of division on the population basis. He differs only in one clause, namely—

‘In apportioning, under paragraph 12 of the Seventh Schedule, the public debt attributable to loans raised by the issue of Government securities, or taken from the Central Government, Reserve bank, or other Bank, account shall be

[Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu] [25th July 1953]

taken of the returns and accumulated surpluses given by the capital works on which the outlays have been made and for which capital accounts are kept by the Government.'

On all the remaining issues, he has agreed to the population basis. With regard to irrigation works and hydro-electric projects, the Government are of the view that division should be on the basis of assets and liabilities. Here lies the main difference between the two propositions. Our proposition is that all the assets including those relating to major projects should be divided on the basis of population. It will be to the advantage of both the States and there will be less troubles and less quarrels. If this principle is accepted, we need not go through all the minor items. Yesterday, the hon. Member Sri Viswanatham paid compliments to the Tamil Nad Communists. They were really just compliments which they richly deserved, while most of the other parties have fallen into communalism and provincialism, the Communist Party alone stood like a rock. They stood for just principles and I hope this House also will stand for the same just principle of dividing the assets and liabilities on the basis of population. With regard to almost all the provisions in the Bill, the population basis was accepted. I do not know why the Government should vary their principle with regard to major irrigation and hydro-electric projects. Sir, the views of the Central Government may differ. But it is we, the two States, that have to bear the brunt of the troubles and quarrels. To avoid all these things, I appeal to all the hon. Members, to whichever State they may belong, to support this view point. With these words, I support the amendment."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, here is a suggestion which has been accepted with regard to so many clauses. As a matter of fact, even the hon. Member Sri Ramakrishna Ayyar and others have given notice of a number of amendments to the effect that the allocation should be on the basis of population. But we have been told that it is a cumbersome process. I do not think it would be so. Whatever the basis may be, we will have to divide certain things. The basis may be different but the bringing of all those things together will have to take place, whether they be assets or liabilities. When those things are brought together, we can very easily divide them on the basis of population. It is always good and safe to adopt simple principles acceptable to all concerned instead of adopting complex principles on different subjects. We were told yesterday that the Communist Party always seemed to put forth some simple principles, but that the subject was not so simple as that. We believe that this subject which looks as though it is very complex is not complex for the simple reason that the principle to be adopted is that division should be on the basis of population. This principle is also a reasonable one and it should be accepted by all without much controversy.

"Another point is this. If this principle is accepted, it will automatically mean that it is accepted with regard to all the clauses in the Seventh Schedule. This principle may or may not be advantageous to us. I am not at all concerned with it because I have

25th July 1953]

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

no facts with me. Without facts, the simple question that we are asked to analyse is how a property has to be divided between the two States. People who have facts available with them may know how much is going to be divided and to whose advantage this principle will be. But we are not in the good books of the Government to get at the facts. What we know is that certain things relating to projects, industries, electricity schemes, public loans, etc., have to be divided between the two States. The Hon. Sri Subramaniam says that he himself does not know these things. I do not know whether he expects us to believe him. Having gone through the whole question for some months, to say that he does not know even the approximate figures is quite unacceptable and unbelievable. In the absence of facts, the only commonsense principle we can evolve is that all the assets and liabilities should be divided on the basis of population. This will ensure reasonable and equitable distribution between the two States. I hope the Government and the House will accept this amendment."

* SRI R. LAKSHMINARASIMHAM DORA :—“ Mr. Speaker, 10-20
Sir, the question of partition involves us in four issues. The issues a.m.
for consideration are what are the assets to be divided, who is to divide them, how and in what manner they have to be evaluated and in what proportion they have to be divided? These are the factors, I should say, relevant factors, that we have to consider now. Mr. Viswanatham's amendment has simply laid down that a Tribunal or Commission should attend to this matter. Clause 46 and the Seventh Schedule both lay down the manner in which the assets are to be divided. Mr. Viswanatham's amendment is not clear on other points, viz., on what proportion the properties should be divided. Now how to evaluate the various properties. On these points, there is bound to be sharp divergence of opinion between the various sections of this House and various parties that are concerned with this partition. Now that we are appointing a High Power Financial Commission, I feel it is better if we leave all these things to be considered and decided by it. That is the best organ to say which property should be divided and how they have to be evaluated and in what proportion—whether as suggested by Mr. Wanchoo, according to the population or by any other method—the properties and other assets have to be divided. Unfortunately, one uniform principle has not been adopted in the report submitted by Mr. Justice Wanchoo. That is why there has been so much discussion. My submission to the House is this. In this House, which is disproportionately divided linguistically it is not possible to come to any conclusion. Moreover, this is a matter in which three States, viz., the new Andhra State, the residuary Madras State and the Mysore State are interested and each will be anxious to safeguard its own interest. So, instead of quarrelling among ourselves in the House, it is better if this matter is left over to be considered and decided by the High Power Financial Commission which will be appointed by the President of the Indian Union.”

[25th July 1953]

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, I have also given notice of a similar amendment which comes under the Seventh Schedule. I think both the amendments can be taken up together for discussion. In proposing this amendment, the Communist party wants to lay down certain basic principles to which the future Andhra State and the residuary State should be committed. Yesterday, when we voted for the appointment of an Expert Committee, the Tamil Communists and some of the Tamil members of the Praja Socialist Party were alone, to support it . . . Sir, I am corrected by my friend. The Malayalee comrades also were with us. Today I find that hon. Members like Mr. Varadachari, Mr. Venkatasubba Reddi and even to some extent my hon. friend Mr. Viswanatham are feeling a bit inconvenienced due to this proposal. I am not surprised at this. When I was receiving a compliment from Mr. Viswanatham, I had a lurking fear in my mind whether I will receive such compliments till the end.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ When I paid my compliment, it was genuine and it could never be otherwise.”

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—“ I really appreciate the genuineness of the compliments. My only wish is that it should be there till the end, and even after partition. It was genuine yesterday. Now, the Communist party does not want to leave things vague. Yesterday, there were some Tamil Members who were feeling and also saying that the Communists have no love for their Tamil State. Even in ‘Dinamani’ paper, reference has been made to this.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ I do not think allegations in newspapers could be referred to and answered on the floor of the House. The hon. Member has got other forums for this purpose.”

SRI S. DEIVASIGAMANY :—“ May I know how these remarks of the hon. Member are relevant to the subject under discussion? ”

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—“ If it is inconvenient to some of the hon. Members, I cannot help it. These remarks are quite relevant. It is not as if the Communists of Madras State—whether they are Tamils, Andhras or Malayalees—are different to the prosperity of the residuary State. We are as much concerned as anybody else in this House with the future of both the residuary Madras State and the Andhra State. That is why we want to lay down certain principles to which both the residuary State and the future Andhra State should be committed, including my friend Mr. Viswanatham. The principle laid down with regard to the division of assets and liabilities, in clause 46 and also Seventh Schedule, is one of shirking responsibility by the Central Government. That is the main principle underlying the present Bill and to which we should direct our attention. In a smoke of confusion, we should not sidetrack the issue. In partitioning this State, the Central Government want to shirk their responsibility in total and

25th July 1953] [Sri M. Kalyanasundaram]

also want to set one against the other. That seems to be the principle adopted by them. I appeal to the hon. Members of this House to consider this subtle underlying current behind this Bill. Knowing the Central Government as we do, there ought to be no surprise at this. It is a fact that they are against redistribution of the country on the basis of linguistic States. By incorporating such provisions in the Bill and by creating so many difficulties, they only want to prove to the world that redistribution of States is quite impracticable. That is why I say that the principles and provisions enunciated by them in the Bill will only lead to endless and continuous hostility after partition between these two States.

"That is why we, Communists, are vitally interested in the good relationship that exists between these two States and we want a basic principle which is not against the interests of either the residuary State or the Andhra State but is against the principle of the Central Government."

10-30
a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"Mr. Hanumantha Rao postulated a theory and formula for buildings, hospitals and capital. Do you accept that?"

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—"I shall leave no doubt in the mind of the Hon. the Finance Minister as to that. We want that both the residuary State and the Andhra State should bring pressure on the Central Government to take some responsibility at least in meeting the extra expenditure that may be incurred. That is the main consideration on which we, Communists, proceed. That is why we are not afraid of making any proposal. That is why we are not afraid of what the Tamil or the Andhra Members would think. We do not have any confusion at all. Sir, a wave of commotion was created and passions were roused in the whole of Andhra on the issue of Madras City. What did the Communists do then?"

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"You are going into a comprehensive defence of the Communist policy."

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—"If the Hon. the Finance Minister gives advice to his men not to talk about our policy, I shall restrict my remarks."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"There was not even talking on this side."

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—"Sir, when we speak of assets and liabilities the Finance Minister need not try to ridicule us by saying that we want every pin or tag in a district office or the revenue inspector's office in Tinnevely or Ramnad to be taken into account. That is not so. The Finance Minister is only trying to twist the issue. When we say assets and liabilities, we mean industrial undertakings, irrigation projects . . . (The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam : 'Do you include land?') certainly not land. I

[Sri M. Kalyanasundaram] [25th July 1953]

know Mr. Hanumantha Rao did not say it and we do not want the files or the furniture in the district offices to be divided. We want only those which can yield some revenue."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Land is a source of revenue and the most important source of revenue. Why not include that also? "

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" We can attach great importance only to the irrigation schemes and certain industrial undertakings. These are important things in our conception of assets and liabilities. Sir, with this clarification, I support this amendment."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, considerable time was taken by the various Communist Members to explain the stand they have taken and also the basic principles they have adopted. We should not only understand the basic principles but also the strategy involved in the Communist Party's principles. Their supreme end is the Party should not crack. Party unity and party interests are their supreme end."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" On a point of order, Sir, do we expect the Hon. Minister to deal with the points that have been raised with reference to the amendment or to deal with the Communist Party? If he wants to deal with extraneous matters, let him say so; we are prepared to discuss and let him accept the challenge."

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is not a point of order."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" That is the supreme end of the Communist Party. They try to hide this end under what they call basic principles so that there may not be a crack in the Party itself. That being their supreme end, when it comes to a question whether they should prove faithful to the area from which they come or whether they should be faithful to the Party, they have decided in favour of the Party ends. That is why even at the risk of being traitors to the State, they want their Party ends to be fulfilled. That is the case with reference to the country itself. When it is a question of country's interests versus Party's interests, the Party interests are given preference. So, even at the risk of proving traitors to the country, they maintain their party."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI.—" On a point of order, Sir, this is the most unmannerly and indecent way of attacking us. We are discussing a certain amendment and Mr. Subramaniam, as Finance Minister, must have felt some responsibility in talking about us in this irresponsible way. Such an irresponsible talk on the part of a Minister is most dangerous and I must tell you that I have got a right of reply before the motion is put to vote. You must allow me to speak before that."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I am glad, Sir, he has spoken in a very decent manner. (Sri T. Nagi Reddi: 'Decency will beget decency'.) Sir, I am not accusing them."

25th July 1953]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

It is an international party and is not confined to one country. It is not confined to one State. The Party is international and it has got its own interests, its own ideals." (Interruption.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Order, order."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI—"I rise with your permission, Sir. We need not generate so much heat . . ."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"We did not."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Please listen to me and then discard my advice if you do not like it. Sir, I was saying that it was unnecessary to generate so much heat or to continue it even though it had been generated. The thing which the Leader of the House has been saying I have said so many times and hon. Members have not objected. (Sri T. Nagi Reddi: 'It is not relevant here.') It is not a question of relevancy. I have said the Communist Party is essentially an international party. He has said they disregard the interests of the State which perhaps does not sound well."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"May I know from the Chief Minister whether it reasons well if it does not sound well? It is neither sound nor reasonable."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"What I said is a statement of truth. From this aspect, I want to analyse the results of voting on the amendments yesterday. When they voted for amendment No. 114, they said democratic principles should weigh in all matters of State. I do not want the House to go back upon that principle. But what democratic principle is involved in handing over the entire thing to two or three people to be appointed by the President whose opinion is to be final? So, there is no question of democracy here. But still they chose to vote in favour of the amendment because they did not want the Party to crack. Having voted for that 'democratic' principle, now they move this resolution—amendment 126—laying down that division should be on population basis."

"Then what is the attitude adopted by Sri Hanumantha Rao? 10-40 a.m.
It is not as if one principle could be adopted for all assets and liabilities. The stand taken by him is, 'Even with regard to that principle I have not included buildings, hospitals, etc., for which different principles should apply. It is stated that a different principle should apply to buildings, capital, hospitals, educational institutions and other equipments. If it is good that we should apply two principles in respect of the two sets of assets and not one principle then taking into consideration the complexity of the matter concerned, and various kinds of assets, differing from each other, built in different ways and worked in different ways, we will have to apply different principles according to the nature of the assets concerned. Therefore, Sir, the Government of India have gone into the whole matter and have suggested equitable and just principles in respect of each asset."

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[25th July 1953]

“ Then, Mr. Hanumantha Rao said that Rs. 2.34 crores for the capital is not enough and that Rs. 4.0 crores or some bigger amount should be given to them because they have got to build a new capital. In the interests of the Andhra State, he said the requirements of the Andhra Government should be taken into consideration and on that basis the compensation should be fixed at Rs. 4.0 crores or Rs. 10.0 crores. Therefore, Sir, it is not the population principle only that they want to apply—they want to apply some other principle also, viz., the requirements of the Andhra Government. Sir, not only the requirements of the Andhra Government, but the requirements of the residuary State and the requirements of the people as a whole in this State also have been taken into consideration and the principles have been evolved by the Government of India.

“ Then, coming to the question of different assets, it has been said that all assets have been taken into consideration and it does not matter whether it is buildings or some other asset. Sir, land is the most important asset we have and it is also a revenue yielding asset. Are we going to value land also and make adjustments with regard to population? And land cannot be moved from one place to another and adjustments have to be made with reference to the value. But they say land is a different thing. So also everything is different. It is not as if the land is something dissociated from the people residing in the locality. Land has attained value by the labour, industry and skill that have been put into it by the people and the Government and it cannot be said that the same principle should be applied to land also. If land also should be included in the assets and the assets and liabilities should be divided on a population basis, I am prepared to accept the amendment. But they do not want land to be included in the assets because it is inconvenient for them. But they want all other kinds of assets to be included in the assets. After all land by itself has no value. What about the improvements, what about the labour and money spent on it? If we do not take into consideration improvements, skill and money, land is valueless. It is not as if land by itself is valuable. It gets value because of the money put into it and because of the contribution made by the Government in putting up roads for the purpose of approaches to the land, because of the irrigation projects that have been constructed and also in some cases of electricity taken to the land. Land has become valuable because of the contribution made by the Government and the community as a whole. If that be so, why should land alone be treated separately? It is because it is inconvenient for them. Therefore, I respectfully submit that there is no meaning in this amendment and we cannot accept it.

“ As a matter of fact, I can point out why certain principles have been adopted in respect of certain assets. For example there is unissued stores and when we take up paragraph (3) of the Seventh Schedule for discussion, I can explain why a certain principle has been adopted. So also the Government Press, the Central Road

25th July 1953] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Fund, the Zamindari Abolition Fund, Public Debt, etc. I can say why a certain principle is adopted in respect of pensions and why another in respect of State Trading Schemes. In fact, if we apply the principle of population to everything, that will be a great burden even on the Andhra State and it is better they realize it. What is the State Trading Scheme? It relates to the Civil Supplies department which is trading in rice. If the property is to remain where it is and if it should be valued and divided on a population basis, I do not know how it is going to help the Andhra State and whether they will be happy about it. The entire requirement of rice is in the residuary State and the Andhra State is surplus in rice. They do not know their interests and they want to take over liabilities without realizing it. Therefore, Sir, we cannot adopt a uniform principle in respect of all assets. For example, let us take the question of loans. Of course, they have to be collected and shared. The Andhra State is to collect the loans, so also the residuary State and then share them. When it is a question of collection, the Andhra State may not take proper interest. But the residuary State is responsible for all the loans. Therefore, Sir, I say that everything has been gone into and principles have been laid down in the Seventh Schedule. Therefore I respectfully submit that this amendment should be thrown out. When the Schedule is taken up for discussion, it would be time when we can say whether a particular principle should be adopted for a particular asset and the Government also have given notice of an amendment. There is no meaning in this amendment and I am sure the House will agree to reject it."

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" Sir, on a point of personal explanation. The Hon. Leader of the House thought it fit to enter into a wholesale attack on the Communist Party. I can understand the cause for his anger. He is so jealous of the Communist Party because it is able to remain united. What is the basis on which he is preserving the unity of various heterogeneous elements if it is not on parochial passions and prejudices and we are hitting at it. That is why he is so angry. I want to make it clear, Sir, that we are not a whit less patriotic than those people."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister for Finance has distorted my speech and I have got to explain my position. The Hon. Finance Minister was referring to many irrelevant things, one amongst them being the supreme interests of the party. Of course, ours is an international party."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member should not repeat what Mr. Kalyanasundaram has said."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" I am not repeating what Mr. Kalyanasundaram has said. But I have got to reply, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member has no right of reply. He can speak only by way of personal explanation."

[25th July 1953]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" I have no objection, Sir, if you allow him on my behalf."

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is not a question of allowing. He cannot reply for another Member."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" Sir, ours is no doubt an international party. It is also a national party. For us there is no conflict between the two. So we are united and we continue to be united."

MR. SPEAKER :—" It is no personal explanation. The hon. Member Sri T. Nagi Reddi will now speak."

SRI C. H. KANARAN :—" On a point of order, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I shall allow the hon. Member after Sri Nagi Reddi speaks."

10-50
a.m.

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" I know, Sir, why the Leader of the House came forward with such unreasonable arguments. I know why he came in at such an untimely moment, to attack the Communist Party. I know why he used such vehement language against the Communist Party. I know why he abused us of being selfish and all that. It is not because we the Communists are unreasonable but it is because the Government of which Mr. Subramaniam is the Finance Minister is unreasonable, that Mr. Subramaniam had butted in at an unreasonable moment to use such a vehement language against us. He is sure that the stand he had taken is unreasonable. Let him search his heart and tell me whether he is reasonable. Let him follow the principle which he and the Hon. Chief Minister hold so sacred, I mean, the principle underlined in the Hindu religion. Let him as a true Hindu touch his conscience and say whether he had been right in using such vehement language against us and slandering us (I mean we, the Communists) that we belong to an international party and we have got only parochial interests and not national interests. That is why the Hon. Mr. Subramaniam had charged Mr. Kalyanasundaram with parochial feelings. That is why he had made a distinction between Mr. Kalyanasundaram and Mr. Nagi Reddi. That is why he had said that Mr. Kalyanasundaram being a Tamilnad Communist, had betrayed national interest for the sake of party feelings by having voted for the motion of Mr. Viswanatham yesterday. Of course it is not as if we, the Communists, have no national interests. It is not as if we, the Communists, can never rouse public opinion. It is not as if, Mr. Nagi Reddi, cannot speak for the masses. Nagi Reddi will speak, can speak and will continue to speak for the masses. Let not Mr. Subramaniam think that only he and the Congress Party that he represents can speak for the masses and that the Congress alone cares for the interest of the nation. Of course, I do admit that we belong to an international party. But that does not mean that we care only for party affiliations and not for the interests of the nation. It is because we belong to an international body we want to imbibe

25th July 1953]

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

what all we have found good in that body for the promotion of our nation. That is the principle on which we work. Let Mr. Subramaniam carefully take note of this point. Let him not without understanding the principle on which we stand, abuse us by saying that we care only for party solidarity and *not* for national interests. Of course we do stand for solidarity within our ranks. But never for a moment think that we would be parochial and not care for the interest of the nation. Let me clearly say that it is not the Communist Party but the Congress Party that is parochial in its aims. It is because it has of late exhibited its parochial attitude in some sectors, that we now see the mass uprising. It is the attitude of the Congress and not the Communists to rouse passions against one another. That is exactly what this Government, of which Mr. Subramaniam forms a part, is doing. As I had already said, the people have awakened. It is not possible any longer to deceive them. Let me now come to the point. What is it that we say? What is it that we want? We want justice, and nothing more than that. Whenever we are about to divide, is it not just and equitable that we know what our assets are? Are we not justified in asking for exact figures? Have the figures been supplied to us? Can it be said that it is not possible for this Government to collect a data of all our stores within five days? Surely, the Government can do it. But they do not want to furnish us with figures. And then when we are about to divide, on what principle should we divide? Who is the best judge? Is it not the people? After all, these properties belong to the people and not to any aristocrat. When such is the state of affairs, is it any wonder that we ask that the division of assets and liabilities between Mysore, Andhra and Madras should be on a population basis? Is it not democratic? If it is not, which is democracy then? Time and again it is said that the Congress Party always follows democratic principles? If it is so, why then should it shirk dividing the assets and liabilities on a population basis? After all, what is Government? Is it not said that Government is of the people, by the people and for the people? Why should the Government shrink from dividing the assets then on a population basis? Of course Mr. Subramaniam may say that 'land' is not an asset. To Mr. Subramaniam's mind 'asset' may not include land. But we the Communists look upon the sweat of the common man's labour on land as an asset (Cheers from Communist benches). I had already said, the Government have not been frank with us. When I wrote previously to some departments asking for details with regard to stores, I got the reply that figures would be furnished in the Assembly. What is it that we found in the Assembly? Were we supplied with facts and figures? No, the answer is a blank 'No'. Then how can Mr. Subramaniam ask us not to have any suspicion on them? Of course it is true that some of us are led to have some suspicion because of the recent attitude of Government. Let me be frank about it. For we cannot help it. When we are asked to give our opinion on a particular clause, is it not justice that we should be supplied with exact figures especially when it is a clause dealing with division of assets and liabilities?

[Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

[25th July 1953]

Without supplying us with relevant figures, Mr. Subramaniam now comes and abuses Mr. Kalyanasundaram as though he had forsaken national interests and cared only for party interests? Let the people judge, whether myself or Mr. Kalyanasundaram or Mr. Subramaniam had been democratic?

"I am not putting forth any strange argument when I say that the assets and liabilities ought to be divided on a population basis. Not only we the Communists favour such a course, any man caring for justice and equity will do so. May be Andhra is rich in the matter of rice. May be Tamilnad is deficient. May be Andhra is not having any single industry worth the name. May be Tamilnad is full of big industries. Are we asking the division of these immovable assets? No. We only say that the movable assets be divided and that too not on any arbitrary formula but on a population basis. No one can say ours is an unjust stand. I do hope that learned friends like Mr. Viswanatham, Mr. Venkatasubba Reddi and others will lend their support to my motion."

(The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam rose in his seat.)

11
a.m.

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"Does it mean, Sir, that the Hon. Minister will be having a right of reply?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"I am entitled to reply, Sir."

* SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—"The person who gives notice of an amendment has a right of reply. The Hon. Minister, I am afraid, has no right of reply and therefore, he cannot speak once more."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member must go through the rules before he raises the point of order. I have allowed the Hon. Minister to speak."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"This motion, I wish to submit to you, Sir, is not a Government motion and therefore, the Hon. Minister has no right of reply."

MR. SPEAKER :—"I have permitted him to speak."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"That is why, Sir, I am appealing to you Sir, that he has no right of reply and cannot speak."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member ended up his speech by characterising me as a school boy. Let me tell him, Sir, that I am glad about it and I am a school boy and I will continue to be a school boy because, Sir, unlike the hon. Member, I feel I have yet a lot to learn and I do not think I have learnt all the things which have got to be learnt. Sri Nagi Reddi may feel that he has come to a stage where he knows everything (Sri T. Nagi Reddi : 'But not as little as the Hon. Minister'), and I congratulate him and let him continue in that attitude but I shall always take the attitude that I do not know much and I have got to learn much more than I know,

25th July 1953] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

in fact infinitely more than I know and I do not lay claim to knowing everything. In that sense I am a school boy, and I am trying to learn and that is my honest attempt and if other people take a different attitude, I congratulate them and let them have their own attitude and they are entitled to it, Sir.

“ Then, Sir, coming to the other point whether facts are necessary for the purpose of laying down principles, even according to Sri Nagi Reddi, facts are not necessary for the purpose of laying down certain principles on the basis of which certain assets should be divided. It is not necessary that we should go into the minutest details, find out and arrive at the value and how it will work. As I have already stated even according to him his amendments have been placed before the House without knowing facts. If he had taken the stand that without having facts in his possession, he cannot decide, there is no place for the amendment at all and he should have merely stated that he was unable to discuss the provision and to make any recommendation. On the other hand if you want to go only to the question if principle without reference to advantages which you may get out of it, the principles should be discussed. To-day at least I am glad he is able to agree to that view. But as far as the facts are concerned, they are quite unnecessary when we are discussing principles. I have already pointed out that it is not possible to accept a blanket formula for everything, buildings, hospitals and things of that kind. When reservation is made in the explanation itself, it will not be possible for any one on this side to accept the amendment and I would therefore, request hon. Members that when the schedule is taken up paragraph by paragraph, they can give their suggestions.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I shall put Mr. Nagi Reddi's amendment No. 126 to vote. The question is—

‘ This Assembly is of the opinion that all types of assets and liabilities, unissued stores, articles, goods and various funds including depreciation reserve funds be divided between Madras, Andhra and Mysore States in proportion to the population of Madras and Andhra States and of the territory transferred to Mysore State.’ ”

The amendment was put and declared lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :

Ayes—147.

Sri K. Adikesavalu Naidu.

„ G. Anjaneyulu.

„ K. Appala Naidu.

„ Bojja Appalaswami.

„ Appa Rao Bahadur, Rajah Meka Rangayya.

„ T. S. Ardhanari.

„ T. C. Atchannaidu.

„ Y. Audinarayana Reddi.

„ M. Bapaiah Chowdary.

„ G. Bapanayya.

„ P. Bapu Naidu.

Sri D. Basivi Reddi.

„ Chandra Ramalingaiah.

„ N. Chenchurama Naidu.

„ V. Chidanandam.

„ P. Chinnama Reddi.

„ V. C. Choodamani Deo.

„ D. Dasaratharamaiah Naidu.

„ M. Doraikannu.

„ P. V. R. Gajapathi Raju, (Raja of Vizianagaram).

„ M. Gangappa.

„ Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.

[25th July 1953]

Ayes—cont.

Sri P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.

- „ K. P. Gopalan.
- „ K. C. Gopalan Unni.
- „ K. Govinda Rao.
- „ P. Gunnayya.
- „ M. Hanumantha Rao.
- „ G. Joseph.
- „ M. Kalyanasundaram.
- „ C. H. Kanaran.
- „ S. Kasireddy.
- „ G. C. Kondayya.
- „ P. Kotaiah.
- „ K. Koti Reddi.

Srimathi Thamra Kotamma Reddi.

Raja V. V. Krishnam Raju Bahadur.

Sri B. Krishnamoorthy Rao.

- „ R. Krishnan.
- „ K. Krishna Rao.
- „ M. Kune Rao.
- „ E. T. Kunhan.
- „ L. Lakshmana Das.
- „ T. Lakshminarayana Reddi.
- „ M. Lakshmanaswamy.
- „ D. Lakshmayya.
- „ R. Lakshmi Narasimham Dora.
- „ B. Lakshminarasa Raju.
- „ G. Latchanna.
- „ V. Madanagopal.
- „ K. Madhavan Nambiar.
- „ K. Malakondayya.
- „ T. Mallayya.

Dr. K. B. Menon.

Sri K. Moidu.

- „ M. Muni Reddi.
- „ S. R. V. P. Murthy Raju.
- „ G. Nageshwara Rao.
- „ T. Nagi Reddi.
- „ N. V. L. Narasimha Rao.
- „ P. Narasimha Reddi.
- „ Kavali Narayana.
- „ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
- „ S. Narayanappa.
- „ M. Narayanasamy.
- „ Asi Neeladrirao Reddi.
- „ K. V. S. Padmanabha Raju.
- „ N. K. Palanisami.
- „ M. Pentannaidu.
- „ T. Potha Raju.
- „ C. Prabakara Choudary.
- „ T. Prakasam.
- „ C. Pulla Reddi.
- „ K. Pundarikasha Charyulu.
- „ K. Rajagopala Rao.
- „ M. Rajeswara Rao.
- „ K. T. Raju.
- „ N. Ramabhadra Raju.
- „ D. Ramabrahman.
- „ P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
- „ B. Ramakrishna Reddi.
- „ S. Ramalingam.
- „ G. Rama Rao.
- „ N. V. Rama Rao.
- „ P. Rama Rao.

Sri V. Rama Rao.

- „ K. V. Ramasamy.
- „ K. V. Ramesam.
- „ A. Rami Reddi.
- „ K. Ramiah.
- „ K. Ramiah Choudary.
- „ K. Ranga Rao.
- „ P. Ranga Reddi.
- „ P. Sangam Naidu.

The Hon. Sri D. Sanjivayya.

Sri B. Sankarayya.

- „ K. Santhappa.
- „ G. Satyanarayana.
- „ H. Satyanarayana Dora.
- „ P. Satyanarayana Reddi.
- „ D. Seetharamiah.
- „ R. Siddanna Gowd.
- „ N. Sivaraj.
- „ N. Sivarami Reddi.
- „ G. Sivasankara Reddi.
- „ K. T. Sridharan.
- „ V. Sri Krishna.
- „ M. Srungaram.
- „ B. Subba Raju.
- „ K. Subba Reddi.
- „ M. Subba Reddi.
- „ C. Subbarayudu.
- „ A. K. Subbiah.
- „ R. B. V. Sudarsana Varma.
- „ P. Suryachandrarao.
- „ K. Suryanarayana.

Raja Sagi Suryanarayana Raju.

Sri G. Suryanarayana.

- „ P. Sayamsundra Rao.
- „ P. Thimma Reddi.
- „ S. Vadivelu.
- „ K. Varadaachari.
- „ M. Veerabhadram.
- „ K. Veeranna Padal.
- „ C. Velukkan.
- „ K. V. Vema Reddy.
- „ S. Vemiah.
- „ K. Venkaiah.
- „ C. V. K. Rao.
- „ R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
- „ K. Venkata Kurmi Nayudu.
- „ Saka Venkata Rao.
- „ Alluri Venkataramaraju.
- „ K. Venkata Setty.
- „ P. Venkatasiviah.
- „ M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
- „ T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.
- „ P. Venkatasubbayya.
- „ A. Venkatasubramaniam.
- „ N. Venkatayya.
- „ P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
- „ Pillalamari Venkateswarlu.
- „ K. Venkatnarayana Dora.
- „ A. Venkatramaiah.
- „ P. Venkatswami Reddi.
- „ T. Viswanatham.
- „ G. Yellamanda Reddi.

11-10
a.m.

Noes—135.

Sri A. Ayyanar.

- „ L. Anandan.
- „ T. Anantha Pai.

Sri Anthony Peter.

- „ A. Appu.
- „ K. Aranganathan.

25th July 1953]

Noes—cont.

- Sri R. S. Arumugam.
 „ S. R. Arumugam.
 „ V. Arumugam.
 „ A. Ayyaru.
 „ K. H. Bomman.
 „ M. Chadayan.
 „ P. Chellathurai.
 „ O. Chengam Pillay.
 „ S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.
 „ V. S. Chinnasami Naidu.
 „ Chinnathambi Thevar.
 „ V. Chinnayya.
 „ Ar. A. Rm. Chokkalingam Chettiar.
 „ D. Dasarathan.
 „ S. Deivasiganany.
 „ M. Dharmalingam.
 „ W. J. Fernandez.
 „ K. Gajapathi Reddy.
 „ T. Ganapathy.
 „ N. Gopala Menon.
 „ G. Govindan.
 „ A. Govindasamy Nayagar.
 „ A. K. Hanumantharaya Gounder.
 „ K. Ishwara.
 „ H. M. Jagannatham.
 „ S. Jayarama Reddiyar.
 „ T. M. Kaliannan.
 „ P. G. Karuthiruman.
 „ Kattimuthu.
 „ M. K. Kempai Gounder.
 „ K. T. Kosalam.
 „ D. Krishnamurthy Gounder.
 The Hon. Dr. U. Krishna Rao.
 Sri P. S. Krishnasamy Ayyangar.
 „ R. Krishnaswami Naidu.
 „ Kunhi Muhamed Shaffee.
 „ R. Kuppuswami.
 The Hon Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nayar.
 Sri S. Lakshmana Goundar.
 „ K. S. Lakshmipathy Naicker.
 „ N. Mahalingam.
 The Hon Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker
 Sri P. G. Manickam.
 „ Y. Manjay Shetty.
 „ M. Marimuthu.
 „ A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.
 „ Mahamed Salih Maraikayar.
 „ N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
 „ M. S. Munisami Pillay.
 „ K. G. Munuswamy Gounder.
 „ P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.
 „ C. Muthiah Pillai.
 „ V. Muthu.
 „ M. C. Muthukumaraswamy.
 „ T. D. Muthukumaraswamy Naidu.
 „ A. Muthuswami.
 „ B. R. M. Muthu Thever.
 The Hon. Dr. R. Nagan Gouda.
 Sri V. R. Nagarajan.
 „ P. S. Nalla Gounder.
 „ B. K. Nallasamy.
 „ K. R. Nallasivam.
 „ O. A. Nanjappa.
 „ G. Narayanasamy Naidu.
 „ R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.
 Sri S. Packirisami Pillai.
 „ M. Palanimuthu.
 The Hon. Sri V. C. Palanisami Gounder.
 Sri V. K. Palanisami Gounder.
 „ S. Panchaksharam.
 „ R. S. K. Pandian.
 „ N. Paramasivam.
 „ B. Parameswaran.
 „ S. Parameswarappa.
 „ K. Parthasarathy.
 „ M. P. Periasami.
 „ S. Radakrishnan.
 „ E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.
 „ C. Rajam Ramaswami.
 „ K. Rajaram.
 „ T. K. Rama.
 „ A. Ramachandra Reddier.
 „ N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
 „ K. Ramasamy Doss.
 „ N. G. Ramaswamy Kander.
 „ V. K. Ramaswamy Mudaliar.
 „ S. Ramasamy Naidu.
 „ S. S. Ramasamy Padayachi.
 „ P. S. Rangasamy Naidu.
 „ R. Rangasamy Gounder.
 „ N. Rathina Gounder.
 „ A. Kathinam.
 „ A. M. Sambandam.
 „ A. Sambasivam.
 „ G. Samia Koorayar.
 „ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
 „ T. V. Sanna i.
 „ P. Selvaraj.
 „ A. Senapathy Gounder.
 „ M. G. Shanker.
 „ K. Shanmugam.
 „ T. Shanmugam.
 The Hon. Sri A. B. Shetty.
 Sri V. S. Sivaprakasam.
 „ S. Somayajulu.
 Dr. T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran.
 Sri A. S. Subbaraj.
 The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
 Sri I. K. Subramania Pillay.
 „ R. V. Swaminathan.
 „ S. Swayamprakasam.
 „ R. Thangavelu.
 „ S. P. Thangavelu.
 „ Thiagaraja Pillay.
 „ S. Thinakaranasami Thevar.
 „ P. K. Thirumurthi.
 „ P. Urkavalan.
 „ G. Vegheesam Pillai.
 „ Vaikuntam.
 „ T. R. Varadan.
 Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu.
 Sri A. Veloo.
 „ O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ S. Venkatrama Ayyar.
 „ K. Venkatramana Gowda.
 The Hon. Sri K. Venkatswamy Naidu.
 Sri K. Vinayakam.
 „ S. C. Virupakshiah.
 „ K. R. Viswanathan.

Ayes 147 ; Noes 135.

The amendment was carried.

[25th July 1953]

11-20
a.m.

SRI PRAGADA KOTIAIAH :—" In view of the decision taken by the House with regard to the principle to be adopted for apportioning the assets and liabilities, is it necessary to discuss the Seventh Schedule? Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want a ruling."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Only the financial aspects of the matter in the Seventh Schedule have been discussed. There are other resolutions of a general nature which have to be discussed."

SRI K. KOTI REDDI :—" The Seventh Schedule is referred to only in Clause 46. Clause 46 is now to be deleted in the face of Sri Viswanatham's amendment which has been accepted by the House. Where is the necessity for the Seventh Schedule to be discussed? "

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Leaving aside financial aspects which have been discussed, there are other provisions in the Seventh Schedule which relate to the location of the capital. There are a number of amendments with regard to that. Amendments Nos. 224, 225, 226, 227, 229 and 230. So this aspect of the Seventh Schedule has to be taken up."

* SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—" Sir, first of all I would like to submit that in view of the two amendments that we have accepted both yesterday and to-day, it will be contradictory to those amendments if we now go into the details of the Seventh Schedule. So far as Mr. Nagi Reddi's statement that there is one clause relating to the location of the capital is concerned, I wish to state that there is no clause as such. But there is a proviso to paragraph 12 (2) which reads as follows :—

'Provided that any loan taken from the Central Government before the appointed day in connection with the construction of buildings, roads or other works in the city of Kurnool for the temporary capital of the State of Andhra shall, to the extent of the expenditure so incurred until that date be wholly the liability of the State of Andhra.'

This is merely a clarification that the debt we take from the Central Government shall be the liability of the new State. That is also one of the financial provisions which will have to be gone into by the neutral Commission. I therefore submit that it is unnecessary for us to go into the Seventh Schedule, because it will be contradictory to our own amendments."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" Sir, I wish to make one submission. The Seventh Schedule relates mostly to financial aspects and as many of the hon. Members have expressed, it is not necessary to go into those details. But, at the same time, this issue of capital is linked up with the Seventh Schedule. If the Hon. Mr. Speaker is allotting separate time for discussing the question of the capital of the new State, that issue can be separated from the Seventh Schedule. The financial aspects in the Seventh Schedule need not be gone into and the discussion of the capital alone may be taken up."

25th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I would like to hear what the Government have to say in the matter.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I do not accept the proposition that, because a vote has been taken and a particular view has been expressed, the thing is closed. We are not dealing with a Bill which we can pass into law. We are only offering our views on matters so that they may be helpful at the time the Bill is taken up in Parliament. Let not technicalities exclude the Members from expressing their views. I did not advise the Leader of the House to go on a technical basis. But there is a limit even to that. The view has been expressed that the apportionment of assets and liabilities should be left to a commission for final disposal and that that commission should adopt the basis of population for the apportionment. The expression of that view does not bar the House from expressing its views on the other provisions in the Seventh Schedule for this reason. Barring the Members belonging to the Communist Party, the vote has gone purely on a linguistic basis. There is no object in repeating the performances over and over again. Therefore it is desirable not to waste any further time on the expression of views. The views are already there. If the Central Government feel that the view expressed by the majority vote in this House either with reference to the appointment of a commission or with reference to the population basis is not the last word on the subject, still there will be some matters which will have to be considered if the Bill is to be based on a different structure. I submit frankly that it is more a matter for the Government to express the difficulties and leave the final decision to the Government of India and Parliament. I therefore submit that we need not waste any further time on the Schedule. 11-30 a.m.

“ With regard to capital, a distinction has to be drawn. The provision with regard to capital is included only as a financial provision, and it will be a waste of time to discuss it in that form. But it is open to any Member to bring in any resolution or express any view apart from the Bill if it will be helpful in piloting the Andhra State Bill. That is how I look upon the position.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ Sir, the decision we have taken is about the apportionment of assets and liabilities. It is provided in the proviso to paragraph 12 (2) in the Seventh Schedule that a certain expenditure is likely to be incurred on the construction of buildings, roads or other works in the city of Kurnool for the temporary capital of the State. My amendment proposes that the money shall be invested in a different place. This is a different issue altogether.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Is it the hon. Member's contention that we should take up the amendment of Mr. Latchanna (No. 224)? ”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ We should take up all the amendments beginning from that amendment (No. 224) relating to changing the place of the temporary capital.”

[25th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" To make it more tidy, all these amendments should be reworded as independent resolutions."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" I have no objection to that."

SRI K. VARADACHARI :—" Sir, my amendment No. 263 seeks to provide that the areas in the Andhra State now served by electricity produced in the Madras State shall be continued to be so served on the existing conditions and terms even after the partition. I have suggested that it may be added as the last paragraph in the Seventh Schedule. It may not be quite relevant to put it in the Seventh Schedule in the present context. I want that it should be discussed as a separate resolution. If the Government give an assurance that the supply of the electricity will be continued, I will withdraw my amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Electricity project also is an asset, and according to the decision taken by the House it will also be divided on the population basis. How can we accept any other basis or principle?"

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Sir, as was rightly pointed out by the Hon. Chief Minister, the Schedule relates to the financial aspect of certain matters, i.e., the apportionment of assets and liabilities. The particular clause in which the word 'Kurnool' occurs is also a financial provision specifying as to who should bear the cost of construction of buildings, roads, etc. Notwithstanding the proposition that has been passed, I say that the Andhra Government must bear the cost. I think the inclusion of that clause in the schedule is due to untidy draftsmanship. It should have been kept separate. Still, the existence of the word 'Kurnool' cannot be taken advantage of to give a right to this House to change the place. The reason is this. The Prime Minister of India laid down a procedure so far as the capital is concerned. It is not a constitutional necessity that the Bill should contain the name of the capital of the State. The Madras Government as well as the India Government thought that we must follow the procedure laid down by the Prime Minister. In pursuance of the Prime Minister's statement, you, Mr. Speaker, were pleased to convene a meeting of the Andhra legislators of this House, and they took a decision. The meeting was not informal and an official record of the proceedings was kept. When a particular procedure was laid down and followed and a decision taken as a preliminary or accessory to the passing of the Andhra State Bill, I submit in all sincerity that we are bound by that decision."

MR. SPEAKER :—" So far as the Speaker is concerned, how can he disallow the amendments? That decision is not binding on the Legislature. Though it may be morally binding, it is not legally binding."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" It is legally, politically, and morally binding. The considerations which prevailed upon you to convene a meeting of the 140 Andhra Members of the Assembly

25th July 1953]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

still remain. It is by virtue of the decision taken then that the word 'Kurnool' itself has been inserted in the Seventh Schedule. The Government of India know that the location of the capital of a particular State need not form part of any particular Statute. That was the reason why they first ascertained the view of only the Andhra Members of the Madras Legislative Assembly. When the decision was communicated to them, they simply mentioned it. Of course, it is quite open to this Legislative Assembly to come forward with a fresh proposition. It is for the House also to consider whether it is worthwhile that a fresh proposition within one month of passing the original proposition should be considered over and over again by Members who are going to constitute the new Legislative Assembly of Andhra, even before the Andhra State comes into existence, and imperil its coming into existence. After the formation of the Andhra State, there will be plenty of time for the new State to sit calmly and consider where the capital has to be permanently located. Then they will be in a position to appreciate realities better. In my opinion the amendment is out of place. Because, a special procedure was then laid down, you were pleased to follow that procedure. We followed it. The Government of Madras followed it, and the Prime Minister of India also followed it, and followed it up . . . "

MR. SPEAKER :—" I ask whether that resolution is legally binding on this Assembly."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I say, Sir, it is binding. That is the view taken by the Government of India. We are all following all the proceedings. They are not informal statements. They are part of the same official records. I submit, Sir, opportunity must not be taken now for a re-agitation and endanger formation of the State. There is no doubt we have got a right to re-agitate. But this is not the time, Sir."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I should like to mention, Sir, for the information of hon. Members that so far as this issue is concerned, we both are on common ground that this is not part of the Seventh Schedule. If at all it is to come it must be a distinct proposition, and I might give notice to the hon. Member who was speaking about it that the Members of the Residuary State, in my opinion, should not take part in this discussion or in the voting. I wanted to explain this quite clearly so that our position may be well understood. I do not say that no resolution can be brought before this House. It is too much for me to say that. But I do not think the Members of the Residuary State should take part."

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—" Sir, on behalf of the Communist party I accept the suggestion of the Hon. the Chief Minister on this issue."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Sir, I am glad that the Chief Minister has made the position clear. I am supporting what Mr. Viswanatham has placed before you in detail. I should have expected

[Sri T. Prakasam]

[25th July 1953]

you, Sir, before you allowed all these amendments to be printed and circulated, to point out to Members that the amendments of Mr. Latchanna and others have all been covered by the decision taken in a special session."

MR. SPEAKER :—" It was not a special session. It was only an informal meeting of the Andhra Members."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" I stand corrected, Sir. It was a special session of the Andhra legislators."

MR. SPEAKER :—" It was not a special session of the Madras Legislative Assembly."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" I agree. That is why I am pointing out to you, Sir, as the Speaker, and as the careful Speaker (laughter) not only ordinary points of difference but points of law and Constitution also. I should have expected you, Sir, when you were acting under the orders of the Prime Minister of India . . . (Interruption.) I stand corrected. I should not have used the word 'orders'. Under instructions from the Prime Minister, in the ordinary course, I was expecting you to say 'this would not arise out of matters that would come before the House', particularly when people without any relevancy to the context, were trying to find out the place where the word 'Kurnool' appeared. That is why I expected you to point out that now. I am telling you that so far as procedure is concerned, Mr. Viswanatham has fully explained. Even speaking from the Constitutional point of view, I am pointing out to you that the whole procedure adopted by you at that time was under instructions given by the Prime Minister of India. So, the matter is closed. It would not come again in this Bill. That was omitted completely. To circumvent that position, various Members re-opened the whole point again. Therefore, Sir, it is out of order. As you say, nobody can prevent a proposition being brought before the House as a wholly separate proposition. Therefore, I object to the methods adopted by various Members who have moved amendments and object to the manner in which they have tried to force this discussion here."

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—" Sir, even though the Andhra Members of the Madras Legislative Assembly at an informal meeting decided upon certain things, it cannot be said that they are legally binding or morally binding on this House. They are not legally binding. The Hon. the Prime Minister wanted to make some suggestion. In order to make that suggestion, he wanted the Andhra Members here to say something. Simply because the Andhra Members of the Madras Assembly chose to suggest something at a particular time, it does not mean that whatever is suggested by the Prime Minister or by the Government of India on the basis of that recommendation is binding on us. So, Sir, I say that that decision is not binding on us. We are certainly empowered to discuss the question of capital and

25th July 1953] [Sri M. Hanumantha Rao]

come to a decision. The final decision can be taken only in Parliament. So, the point of order is not valid. That is my submission."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Sir, there seems to be a general consensus of opinion in the House that the decision taken at a meeting of the Andhra Members of the Assembly is morally binding, if not legally binding. A moral obligation, I suppose, is much more weighty than a legal obligation and as such is relatively more obligatory on the House." 11-50 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER :—" If that is so, he may ask Sri Latchanna not to move his amendment."

DR. K. B. MENON :—" I believe, Sir, that to re-open the issue now in this Assembly is not quite fair. I hope that Resolution will not be taken up. I submit some verbal omission or mistake or whatever you may call it in the drafting should not be taken advantage of. The very spirit of it will thereby be broken."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, we are here on a very important question concerning the life of the Andhra State. It is said that the mention of the City of Kurnool here is by the way. It is not as if it were a casual mention. It is not so very incidental as it looks, because the mention of it is very particular in certain connexion. We find the expression in the Bill 'construction of buildings and other works in the City of Kurnool for the temporary Capital of Andhra'. That means before the formation of the State itself certain constructions are going to take place. Hence, certain financial commitments are there. Naturally, we are very anxious that the matter should be taken up."

" Secondly, we can discuss certain things which are not specifically mentioned in the Bill. For example, there is nothing about the Boundary Commission in the Andhra State Bill. Still, we discussed and passed a certain Resolution on that matter. So, while on the Andhra State Bill, every pertinent question concerning the Andhra State can be brought forward in the State Legislature, and the opinions of the Members ascertained. At present, it looks as though the non-Andhras are not going to take part in the voting. It looks as though only the Andhra Members are going to decide the issue. That is, however, a different matter."

" As regards the question of legality, we, of course, passed a Resolution at an informal meeting of the Andhra Members of the Assembly. Now, we have got a chance to express our opinion here again, since we have had certain new experiences. This is an official meeting of the Assembly. I am sure the opinions of the Members of this House will have greater value when we go into the question. So, I think there is no legal commitment in the Resolution that has already been passed."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" Sir, let me submit that this amendment is also based on moral grounds. It is not at all

[Sri G. Latchanna]

[25th July 1953]

brought forward with any ulterior motives. The point raised here is whether the same Andhra legislators can change their mind when once they have taken a decision on the subject in the past. But the same Constitutional procedure provides that the House as well as the Andhra Members are at liberty to view things in a practical manner and make any necessary changes. They are at liberty to put forth their viewpoints. We are not doing anything unconstitutional. If we are to consider this question in a moral spirit, I am convinced that all the Members will agree to a change."

* SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—" The discussion has made one point clear that the hon. Members are taking the opportunity of this meeting of the Madras Legislature to re-open a question, the location of the capital, which was decided at a special meeting of the Andhra legislators, that you were pleased to call at the request of the Prime Minister of India. Now, the hon. Members are taking the opportunity to convert this meeting of the Madras Legislature into a meeting of the Andhra legislators alone."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Only some Members might abstain from voting."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I am sorry such a wrong twist should be given to the matter. There are occasions when we have to decide not to participate in a particular question or debate or voting. It is not a question of converting the whole House into the Andhra Legislature. As a matter of fact, the Speaker is in the Chair. The other meeting was presided over by Sri Prakasam. This is a different meeting altogether and we are participating though we may keep quiet. It is not as if we do not participate."

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—" It is not illegal. But that would be the result."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Members have abstained from voting on many occasions."

* SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—" Yes, Sir. But I humbly submit that the Members of the Andhra Legislature have a right to convene a meeting constitutionally and change the location of the capital within six months if they want."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I am not going to cover the same ground as has been already covered. But the Hon. the Chief Minister tried to draw a distinction that Sri Prakasam presided over the meeting of the Andhra legislators and not you. If I remember aright, you stated that as you did not know Telugu, you would nominate Sri Prakasam in your place."

25th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER :—" I am going to give a ruling on this matter. I have heard enough. No doubt, I was asked to convene a meeting of the Andhra legislators and I was asked to preside. But, as has been said by the hon. Member, Sri Viswanatham, as I was ignorant of Telugu, I asked Sri Prakasam to preside over the meeting. But it was not a meeting of the Legislative Assembly. We must make a distinction between that meeting and this meeting. Now, I think the amendment of the hon. Member, Sri Latchanna, fits in with the clause. So, I ask him to move his amendment. (Cheers.) After it is moved and seconded, other hon. Members can move their amendments."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" I beg to move the following amendment :—

" 224. *This Assembly recommends that for the word "Kurnool" occurring in paragraph 12 (2), the following words shall be substituted :—*

" Tirupati or any other place in Chittoor district which may be more conveniently situated in matters deemed to be essential for the Capital of State and with easy communications with the Northern Circars." "

The amendment was duly seconded.

(Several hon. Members stood up.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" I can't understand why several hon. Members should stand up. I am on my feet now."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Sir, if the amendments are moved as separate amendments, all of them can be put to vote one after the other."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member cannot have it both ways. Suppose the amendment of Sri Latchanna is that instead of the word 'Kurnool', the word 'Tirupati' be substituted. If that is accepted by the House, the other amendments will not be put to vote."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Now that we are taking the opinions of the House, unless the hon. Members withdraw their amendments, they should be put to vote."

MR. SPEAKER :—" How can the House accept two motions on the same subject? We must follow certain parliamentary procedure."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Originally it started like this. A resolution was moved that Kurnool be the temporary capital of Andhra. Now it is not here. So let us treat all the resolutions as separate resolutions."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I must tell the hon. Member that the amendment of Sri Latchanna fits in with the clause. I have allowed him to move his amendment. Sri Nagi Reddi may move his amendment also."

[25th July 1953]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Hon. Members are making, I fear, a mistake. This amendment is really, as I said already, a Resolution to put a view down on paper. The other views would be amendments to that main thing. Let hon. Members remember that an amendment is put to vote before the main proposition. There is no reason for any quarrel about it.”

12 noon. SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ Sir, the main provision only refers to Kurnool. Mr. Latchanna's amendment refers to Tirupati. But, our amendment refers to Vijayavada. So, why not we move our amendments separately, instead of moving them as amendments to the amendment of Mr. Latchanna? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ According to the procedure that we are following here, when an amendment is moved in the first instance, other amendments that are moved subsequently have to be moved only as amendments to the first amendment.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ My submission to you is this. Let all the amendments be taken up in the order in which they are given in the printed list. I think this is what we did with regard to the other amendments.”

* SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—“ Sir, the original proposal relates to Kurnool. Some of the amendments refer to Tirupati, some refer to Vijayavada and so on. So, it will be better if all these amendments, which are amendments to the original proposal, are taken up separately.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let hon. Member, Sri Latchanna, move his amendment now. The other amendments may be moved afterwards . . . ”

(Some hon. Members stood up in their seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Let nobody try to teach me about procedure. I am going to follow the procedure that I have already indicated. I am not going to follow any other procedure.”

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ Sir, a decision has already been taken on this issue. Some word from some Schedule is taken and on that basis attempts are being made to circumvent the whole affair. It is not fair, it is not proper and it is not just, apart from legality or constitutionality.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ Sir, my amendment is a different one. It relates to Vijayavada.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member may move it.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ Sir, I move the following amendment :—

‘ 226. This Assembly is of the opinion that the Capital of the Andhra State be located in Vijayavada.’ ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ I second the amendment.”

25th July 1953]

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—" On a point of order, Sir . . . "

MR. SPEAKER :—" I am not going to allow any point of order now. Let him raise it afterwards."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—" I have given notice of two amendments, viz., Nos. 230 and 235. But I move only amendment No. 235 which reads as follows :—

'For the word "Kurnool" substitute the words "Guntur to Vijayavada".'

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" I second the amendment, Sir."

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—" Sir, there is amendment No. 275 (3) which also relates to this question. Let it also be taken up now along with other amendments."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Let not the hon. Member move that amendment now. We have already taken up Mr. Nagi Reddi's amendment which also relates to Vijayavada."

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—" Let my amendment be taken up first, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I cannot do it. Mr. Nagi Reddi has already moved his amendment."

SRI K. VENKATANARAYANA DORA :—" ఆధ్యక్షా, నేను నా 224 వ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" The hon. Member says that there is another amendment standing in his name on the same subject, and that it may also be taken up."

MR. SPEAKER :—" All right, let him also move his amendment."

SRI K. VENKATANARAYANA DORA :—" నా సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను—

'231. This Assembly recommends that for the word "Kurnool" in sub paragraph (2) of paragraph 12, the word "Visakhapatnam" be substituted.'

The amendment was duly seconded.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Mr. Latchanna will now speak."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" ఆధ్యక్షా, ఈ 224 వ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను గురించి కొన్ని విషయాలను నేను మనవి చేయ దలచుకొన్నాను. కొంతమంది గౌరవసభ్యులు ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించవలసిన ఆసపరంలేదని ఇంతకుముందు తెలియ జేశారు. భారత ప్రధాన మంత్రి పండిట్ నెహ్రూగారి ఆదేశానుసారంగా ఆంధ్ర శాసన సభ్యులు సమావేశమై ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్ర తాత్కాలిక రాజధాని నగరాన్ని పేర్కొనిన తరువాత తిరిగి ఈ సమస్యను తిరగబోడడం, ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదించడం సమంజసమా అని ప్రశ్నిస్తున్నారు. ఇటువంటి సవరణను ఈ తరుణంలో ప్రతిపాదించడం నైతికంగా తప్పు అని మరికొంతమంది సభ్యులు అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నారు. అటువంటి

[Sri G. Latchanna]

[25th July 1953]

సోదర సభ్యులతో అంగీకరింపజాలనందుకు చాలా విచారిస్తున్నాను. ఎట్టి పరిస్థితులలో కర్నూలు తీర్మానం ఆమోదించబడినది, తరువాత ఎటువంటి పరిస్థితులు దేశంలో ఏర్పడినవి అన్న విషయాలను దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని ఈ విషయాన్ని పునఃపరిశీలన చేయుటకు ఎవ్వరికైనా స్వేచ్ఛ ఉన్నదని నా అభిప్రాయము. వెనుక ఒక నిర్ణయంచేసి ఉండవచ్చు. ప్రజాభిప్రాయం అందుకు భిన్నంగా ఉన్నదని తెలుసుకొనిన తరువాత దానిని సవరించుకొనబూసడంలో తప్పు ఎంతమాత్రం లేదని ముఖ్యచేస్తున్నాను. కర్నూలు నిర్ణయం జరిగిన తరువాత ప్రజాభిప్రాయం ఏ విధంగా ఉన్నదో తెలుసుకొని దానిని సవరించుటకు మేము నిష్పక్షపాతబుద్ధితో, నిష్కల్మష హృదయంతో ఈ సవరణను ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నామని మరల గౌరవ సభ్యులందరకు ముఖ్యచేస్తున్నాను. ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర రాజధాని విషయంలో మేము మొదటినుంచి ఒక విస్తృతమైన విధానాన్ని అనుసరిస్తున్నాము. మేము కృషికార్ లోక్ పార్టీగా ఏర్పడినప్పటినుంచీ కాకుండా, ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర కాంగ్రెస్ సభ్యులుగా ఉండినప్పటినుంచీకూడా శ్రీ బాగ్ ఒడంబడికను మన్నించవలెనని చెబుతూ వచ్చాము. తదనగుణంగా అనేక పర్యాయములు తీర్మానించాముకూడా. అసలు ఈ శ్రీ బాగ్ ఒడంబడిక అనేది ఉత్తర సర్కార్, రాయల సీమ ప్రజలమధ్యగల భేదాభిప్రాయాలను తొలగించి ఐక్యత్వాన్ని పెంపొందించుటకు నుద్దేశించబడిన దనే విషయాన్ని ఆందరు గుర్తించవలసి ఉంది. ఈ ఉభయ ప్రాంతాల ప్రజలలోను సామరస్యాన్ని పెంపుచేసే నిమిత్తమే మేము ఎంతోకాలంగా రాయలసీమలోనే రాజధానిని ఏర్పాటుచేయాలని, తద్వారా రాయలసీమ వాసులలో దురదృష్టవశాత్తు ఏర్పడిన అనుమానాలను తొలగించవలెనని చెబుతూవచ్చాము. అయితే రాయలసీమలో ఎక్కడ రాజధానిని ఏర్పాటుచేయవలెననే ప్రశ్న వచ్చినప్పుడు ఉత్తర సర్కారులవారికి రాకపోకల విషయంలోను, ఇతర విధాలా అందుబాటుగా ఉండే చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలో రాజధానిని ఏర్పాటుచేయడం మంచిదని, చిత్తూరు జిల్లాలోని తిరుపతి అందుకు తగినదని ఎంతోకాలంగా మేము చెబుతూవచ్చాము.

(At this stage, Srimathi T. Kotamma Reddi occupied the Chair.)

తిరుపతిలో అన్ని సౌకర్యములు ఉన్నవి. తిరుపతిలో రాజధానిని ఏర్పాటు చేసినందువల్ల ఇటు రాయలసీమ వాసులను సంపూర్ణపరచవచ్చు అటు ఉత్తర సర్కారు ప్రజలకు రాకపోకల విషయంలోను, ఇతర విషయాలలోను గల ఇబ్బందులను తొలగించవచ్చు. అంతేకాదు ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర నిర్మాణాన్ని గురించి సాకల్యంగా అన్ని విషయాలను పరిశీలించి కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి నివేదించిన న్యాయమూర్తి వాంచూ గారి అభిప్రాయ ప్రకారంగాకూడా తిరుపతి రాజధానిగా ఉండుటకు తగిన ప్రదేశం. ఈ సందర్భంలో వాంచూగారు ఏమని వ్రాశారో జ్ఞప్తికి తెచ్చుకొనవలసినదని గౌరవ సభ్యులకు విన్నవించుకొంటున్నాను. ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర రాజధాని తాత్కాలికంగా కొంతకాలం మదరాసులో ఉండవలెనని, ఇక శాశ్వత రాజధాని విషయంలో విజయ వాడ-గుంటూరుల మధ్య ప్రాంతంగాని, తిరుపతిగాని, తగిళుంటాయని వాంచూగారు అభిప్రాయపడ్డారు. వాంచూగారి అభిప్రాయానికిగాని శ్రీ బాగ్ ఒడంబడికకుగాని ఉత్తర సర్కారులవారి సౌఖ్యార్థానికిగాని భంగం రానివిధంగా అందరి అభిప్రాయములను సమన్వయపరచి, సామరస్యం పెంపుచేసే ఉద్దేశంతో మేము తిరుపతిలో రాజధానిని ఏర్పాటుచేయవలసినదని స్థూచించినాము. అయితే కారణాంతరాలవల్ల గత నెలలో జరిగిన ఆంధ్ర శాసన సభ్యుల సమావేశంలో కర్నూలు నిర్ణయం జరిగినది, అయితే ఆ నిర్ణయం జరిగినతరువాత ప్రజలలో ఎటువంటి సంబంధం కలిగింది, పరిస్థితులలో ఎటువంటి విష పరిణామాలు సంభవించాయి అనే యదార్థ విషయాలను మనం విస్తరించరాదు. ఏ ఐక్యత్వాన్ని, సామరస్యాన్ని సాధిద్దామని మనం కర్నూలు నిర్ణయం

25th July 1953]

[Sri G. Latchanna]

చేసినామో, ఆ నిర్ణయంవల్ల దుష్ప్రతిభలే సంభవించాయి. కర్నూలు నిర్ణయం రాయలసీమ, ఉత్తర సర్కారు ప్రజల మధ్య సామరస్యాన్ని పెంచేదిగా కాకుండా, దైవేచ్ఛ విభేదాలను పెంచేదిగా పరిణమించినదనే విషయం ఎవరూ కాదనలేదు. ప్రజలు, పులికలు ఈ విషయాన్ని పోషిస్తున్నాడన్నాయి. దీనినికూడా మన మెత్తరం కాదనలేము. ఏదో ఒక నిర్ణయం చేసినతరువాత తప్పైనా, ఒప్పైనా ప్రజా బాహుళ్యానికి అంగీకారమైనా, కాకపోయినా దానినే పట్టుకొని వ్రేళ్లాడు తామని దానినే బలపరచాలని ఆ నైతిక బాధ్యత మనమైన ఉన్నదని చెప్పడం సరికాదని సవినయంగా మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఒక నిర్ణయం తప్ప అని తెలియ వచ్చినప్పుడు, ప్రజా బాహుళ్యం దానిని తిరస్కరించినప్పుడు, దానిని సవరించు కోవడమే విజ్ఞత అని నా భావం. అందుచేతనే, నిష్కర్షిత బుద్ధితో, నిష్కల్పక మృదయంతో, రాయలసీమ, ఉత్తర సర్కారు ప్రజల మధ్య తిరిగి సామరస్యాన్ని పెంపు చేయవలెననే సంకల్పంతో శ్రీ చాగ్ ఒడంబడికను అనుసరించి, తిరుపతిలోనే రాజధానిని ఏర్పాటు చేయవలెనని మేము అభిప్రాయపడుతున్నాము. ఈ విషయాన్ని ప్రతి కాంగ్రెస్ సభ్యుడు గమనించవలెనని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. మనమందరము కలసి ఇదివరలో చేసిన నిర్ణయంవల్ల వ్యతిరేకమైన ఫలితములు కలిగినవనే విషయాన్ని దృష్టిలో ఉంచుకొని, సర్దులకు అంగీకారయోగ్యమైన తిరుపతిని రాజధానిగా ఆమోదించవలెనని గౌరవ సభ్యులకందరకు, నేను ప్రత్యేకంగా మనివిచేయ దలచుకున్నాను. వెనుకటి నిర్ణయం సరికాదని ప్రజలు మనకు తెలియజేసినారు కాబట్టి, మనము విషయాన్ని పునరాలోచించి అందరకు అంగీకారమైనటువంటి విధంగా మన నిర్ణయాన్ని సవరించుకోవడం ప్రజాస్వామ్య సూత్రాలకు అనుగుణమైనటువంటిదని, ఆ విధంగా వర్తించడం మనందరయొక్క కర్తవ్యం, బాధ్యత అని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

12-10
p.m.

“మా ఉద్దేశ్యంపట్ల మిగతా సభ్యులకు వేరువేరు అభిప్రాయాలు కలుగవచ్చును. కాని మా తీర్మానంలో యథార్థాన్ని కప్పిపుచ్చి, లేనిపోని వాగ్దానాలు చేసేటటువంటి అభిప్రాయం లేదని, అటువంటి పద్ధతి ప్రజాస్వామిక విధానానికి విరుద్ధంగా ఉంటుందని, కనుక అటువంటి కఠోర ఉద్దేశ్యాల్లేవి ఇందులోలేవని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఇదివరలో మనము చేసినటువంటి నిర్ణయంవల్ల సర్కారు ప్రజలకు, రాయలసీమవారికి ఒక విధమైనటువంటి కోపతాపాలయొక్క, ఉద్దేకలయొక్క వాతావరణం కలిగిందనే సంగతి గమనించి దానిని సమస్యయవరచడానికి ఒక ప్రయత్నం తప్పని సరిగా అవసరమని గుర్తించి ఈ తీర్మానం తీసుకురాబడిందని సోదర సభ్యులందరిని గమనించ గోరుతున్నాను. ఈ విషయాన్ని ఒక సదభిప్రాయముతో పరిశీలించి, రాయలసీమకు ఉత్తర సర్కారులలో ఓర్వడిన బేధాభిప్రాయాన్ని సమస్యయవరచడానికి ఒక ప్రయత్నం తప్పకుండా చేయవలసియుంటుందనే విషయాన్ని గుర్తించి, మేము ఈ రోజున ఈ ప్రతిపాదన తెచ్చామనే విషయాన్ని గమనింపగలిగాము. కనుక ఈ ప్రతిపాదన పట్ల మీరందరుకూడా సదభిప్రాయముతో దీనిలోని మంచివెడ్డలు ఆలోచించి, ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని బలపరచవలసిందని కోరుతూ ఇంతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI M. NARAYANASWAMI :—“ఉపాధ్యక్ష, కర్నూలు రాజధాని అనే నిర్ణయాన్ని గతములో ఆంధ్ర శాసనసభ్యులందరూ ప్రత్యేకంగా సమావేశమై దీర్ఘంగా చర్చించడం జరిగింది. కనుక తిరిగి ఈ విషయాన్ని ఈ రోజున చర్చించాలా, లేదా, అనే సమస్యవెనకూడ చాలా వాదోపవాదాలు, తర్జన భర్జనలు దీర్ఘంగా జరిగిన అనంతరం మనము ఈ రాజధాని సమస్యమీద ఇప్పుడు మరల చర్చకువచ్చాము. ఈ సందర్భమున గౌరవనీయ సభ్యులు లచ్చన్నగారు మాట్లాడుతూ, మనం ఇదివరకుచేసిన

[Sri M. Narayanaswami]

[25th July 1953]

కర్నూలు నిర్ణయంవల్ల రాయలసీమవారికిని, సర్కారువారికిని బేధాలు వచ్చాయని గనుక ఆ బేధాలను తొలగించి ఇరువురిని సమన్వయపరచడానికి, రాజధాని కర్నూలుగా కాకుండా, తిరుపతిలో ఉండవలసిందనే తీర్మానం తీసుకురావడం జరిగిందని, తిరుపతి చాలా సుందరంగా ఉంటుందని, ఆంధ్రప్రాంతానికి అందుబాటులో ఉంటుందని చెప్పారు. కాని ఈ కర్నూలు నిర్ణయంవల్ల సర్కారు రాయలసీమ ప్రజలకు విభేదాలు వచ్చాయో లేదా అనే విషయాన్ని ఆలోచించేటప్పుడు, ముఖ్యంగా ఇటీవల ప్రతికలద్యారాను, ఉపన్యాసాలద్యారాను ప్రధానంగా సంజీవ రెడ్డిగారు, వారి పార్టీ వారు, ప్రజలలో ఈ విభేదాలను కల్పించేవిధంగా ప్రజలను రెచ్చగొట్టారని చెప్పవలసి యున్నది. ఈ రాజధాని విషయములోనే కాకుండా, ఇతర విషయాలలో కూడా ప్రజలను రెచ్చగొట్టి, ఈ విభేదాలను తీవ్రతరం చేశారు. సర్కారు ప్రజలు ఇప్పటికే ప్రాశస్త్యంతో లభిస్తున్నారని, నాదికొండ ప్రాజెక్టుకూడ వారికి లభిస్తుంది గనుక, ఆ ప్రాజెక్టుకూడదని చెప్పి ఈ రకమైన ప్రకటనలు ఉపన్యాసాలు చేస్తూ సర్కారు, రాయలసీమ మధ్య విద్వేషాలను, విభేదాలను కల్పించి ప్రజలను రెచ్చగొట్టడానికి సంజీవ రెడ్డిగారు పూనుకొన్నారు. అందుచేతనే ఈనాడు ఇదివరకు నిర్ణయించిన కర్నూలు కాకుండా, అందరికీ అందుబాటులో ఉండేటటువంటి తిరుపతి రాజధానిగా ఉండవలసిన చెప్పినప్పుడు, నాకు మరియు నాలాంటి కొంతమంది మిత్రులకు దీనిని అర్థం చేసుకోవడానికి ఏలులేకుండా ఉన్నది. వారి ఉద్దేశ్యము రాజధాని అందరికీని అందుబాటులో ఉండవలసే అయితే, వారి నిర్ణయాన్ని మార్చుకొని ఈ విషయాన్ని ఇంకా బాగా పునరాలోచించి, అందరికీని వాస్తవంగా అందుబాటులో ఉండేటటువంటి విజయవాడ-గుంటూరు మధ్య రాజధానిని నిర్ణయించినట్లైతే చాలా బాగుంటుందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయములో వాంఛాగా ఉచ్చిస్తుంటే అభిప్రాయాన్ని గుర్తించి ఉంటే బాగుండేది. తరువాత లచ్చన్నగారు, శ్రీ బాగు ఒడంబడికను refer చేశారు. కాని వారి పార్టీలోని ఒక మిత్రుడే ఈ రోజున ముఖ్యపక్షం విశాఖపట్టణమైతే బాగుంటుందని దానికి సవరణ ఇస్తూ సూచించారు. దీనిపట్టి చూస్తే వారి పార్టీ వారినే ఈ శ్రీ బాగు ఒడంబడిక విషయములో convince చేయలేకపోయారని తెలుస్తున్నది. కనుక శ్రీ బాగు ఒడంబడిక అనేదాన్ని ప్రధానంగా తీసుకోకుండా, ఈ విషయాన్ని ప్రత్యేకంగా పరిశీలించిస్తుంటే వాంఛాగారి అభిప్రాయాన్నే కాకుండా, ప్రజలందరియొక్క అభిప్రాయాన్ని వారి సౌకర్యాన్ని గుర్తించవలసి యుంటుందని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఇదివరకే ఈ విషయాలన్నిటిని దీర్ఘంగా చర్చించాము కాబట్టి, ఈనాడు మరల ఈ విషయాలలో లోతుకు వెళ్లడం అంటే కాలం వ్యర్థం అవుతుంది. కనుక ఆంధ్రులందరికీ కూడా ఉపయోగముగా ఉండేటటువంటి, సౌకర్యముగా ఉండేటటువంటి ఎక్కువ డబ్బు ఖర్చుపెట్టవలసిన అవసరములేనటువంటి, వ్యాపారరీత్యాను, ఇతర అన్ని విధాలాను ఉపయోగకరంగా ఉండేటటువంటి పట్టణాన్ని రాజధానిగా నిర్ణయించి ఉంటే బాగుండేది. కర్నూలును బలపరుస్తున్నటువంటి పెద్దరస ప్రకాశంగారుకూడ నిన్న మాట్లాడుతూ, మనం ఆదవులకు పోతున్నామని చెప్పారు. మనం అవిధంగా అజ్ఞాతవాసం వెళ్లనవసరంలేదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. అన్ని విధాల అనుకూలమైనటువంటి గుంటూరు, విజయవాడ పట్టణాలుండగా, అరిత్యా లకు వెళ్లవలసిన అవసరమేమో అర్థంకావడంలేదు. మనం దీర్ఘంగా ఆలోచించినట్లైతే, మనకు రాజధానికి తగిన పట్టణాలు లేకపోలేదని, గుంటూరు, విజయవాడ పట్టణాలు అందుకు తగిన పట్టణాలని గుర్తించవచ్చును. వ్యాపారరీత్యాను, రైల్వే రాకపోకల రీత్యాను, ఆంధ్రదేశానికంతకు కేంద్రంగా ఉండే విషయంలోను, అన్ని విధాల గుంటూరు, విజయవాడ ప్రాంతములు అనుకూలంగా ఉంటున్నవి. అందుకనే రాజకీయంగా కూడ, ఈనాడు అన్ని పార్టీలవారు అక్కడనే తమ పార్టీ ఆఫీసులు

25th July 1953] [Sri M. Narayanaswami]

పెట్టుకొన్నారు. కమ్యూనిస్టుపార్టీ వారియొక్క ఆంధ్రలో ఉన్నటువంటి ఒకే ఒక దిన పత్రిక, విశాలాంధ్ర అనేది ఆంధ్రదేశములో ఉన్నటువంటి గ్రామ నీరులన్నింటి పట్టుకూ ను ప్రతిబింబించేటువంటి పద్ధతిలో విజయవాడలోనే నడుచున్నది. ఆ విధంగా అన్ని విషయాలలోను, ఒక రాకపోకల విషయంగానీ, పత్రికల విషయంగానీ, అన్ని విషయాలలోను మనకు రాజధాని విజయవాడ, గుంటూరు, ముఖ్యంగా విజయవాడ, అన్ని ధాలుగా ఆ కులంగా ఉంటున్నది. కనుక దానినే బహుళ వలసినదని మన ఆంధ్రమిత్రులను ప్రత్యేకముగా నేను కోరుచున్నాను. నీటి కరువు గురించి మాట్లాడడం నేటి నీటి కరువు చాలాచోట్ల ఉన్నది. ఆంధ్రదేశంలో ముఖ్యంగా నీటి కరువు చాలా పట్టణాలలో ఉన్నది. రాయలసీమలో ప్రతి ప్రాంతములో నీటి కరువు, తిండి కరువుకూడ ఉండగా సర్కారు జిల్లాలలో అనగా, గుంటూరు జిల్లాలోను, కృష్ణా జిల్లాలోను నీటికరువు ఉన్నది. ఆయితే విజయవాడలో నీటికరువు కూడ లేకుండా వుంటుంది. కనుక అన్నివిధాల విజయవాడ రాజధానికి తగినపట్టణముగా ఉంటున్నది. ఆయితే కమ్యూనిస్టులు సూచించినటువంటి ఈ నిర్ణయానికి మన మెట్లా వోటుచేయడం, కమ్యూనిస్టులు సూచించినదాన్ని మన మెట్లా అంగీకరించడం అని సందేహ రెడ్డిగారు చెప్పుచున్నట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. కాని, ఆంధ్రదేశానికంతకు సంబంధించినటువంటి ఈ రాజధాని విషయములో పార్టీ విభేదాలు పెట్టుకొని వ్యవహరించడం ఏ మాత్రం సబబుకాదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఆంధ్రదేశానికంతకు, ఆంధ్రజాతికంతకు ఏదైతే వాగుంటుంది, ఏదైతే ప్రజానీకానికంతకు అంగీకారంగాను, ఉపయోగకరంగా ఉంటుంది అనే దృష్ట్యాంతో ఆలోచించవలసి యుంటుందేగాని, ఇది కమ్యూనిస్టులు సూచించారని లేక మహాకరు సూచించారని, పార్టీ విభేదాలు, కక్షలు తీసుకొని రాకూడదు. ఇంతకు ముందు గూడ ఒక సవరణ వోటుకు పెట్టవచ్చును పార్టీ విభేదాలు పాటించకుండా వోటుచేయడం జరిగింది. అందు చేత దీనిని ఎవరు ప్రవేశ పెట్టారు అనే దృష్ట్యాంతో కాకుండా, ఆంధ్రప్రజానీకాన్నంతను దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని, అందరికీ ఉపయోగకరముగా ఉండేటువంటి నిర్ణయమవుతూ కాదా అని చూడవలసినదని మిత్రులందరికీ మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఒకమాసము క్రిందట ఏదో ఒక నిర్ణయం చేశాము. అది చేసినతరువాత ఆ స్థలం ఏ విధముగా ఉందని, అనేకమంది ఆక్షేపకులు వెల్లి పరిసరము దూచి వచ్చారు. ప్రజాభిప్రాయం ఏ విధంగా వుందో తెలుసుకొన్నాము. పత్రికలు ఏమి చెప్పుచున్నవో వింటున్నాము. విభేద పార్టీ వారు ఏ ధోరణిలో ఉన్నారో తెలుస్తున్నది. కొంతకాలము ఇవన్నీ గమనించిన అనంతరం, మరల ఈ నిర్ణయం గురించి పునరాలోచించే సదవకాశం మనకు వచ్చినది. అందుకనే ఈ విషయమై ఇప్పుడు మరల కొన్ని సవరణలు తీసుకరాబడివి కనుక, మన నిర్ణయాన్ని సరిదిద్దుకోగల ఈ సదవకాశమున ఇది కమ్యూనిస్టుల తీర్మానమనే అభిప్రాయాన్ని సందేహ రెడ్డిగారున్ను, వారి పార్టీవారున్ను అందరు ఈ ఉదయమే వదలుకొని, ఆంధ్రదేశముయొక్క ప్రజలయొక్క శ్రేయస్సును దృష్టిలో నుంచుకొని విజయవాడే ముఖ్యపట్టణముగా ఉండునట్లు మనమందరము దానికి వోటు చేయాలని కోరుతూ విరమిస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI G. NAGABHUSHANAM :—“ Madam, I do not want to enter into any controversy on this occasion. I agree with Mr. T. Viswanatham and Mr. T. Prakasam. The Sri Bagh Pact was entered into in 1937 for the purpose of creating unity among the Andhras, namely, between the Coastal districts and the Rayalaseema. That was the object of the Pact so that there might not be discontentment among the various sections in the Andhra area. Then, another pact was entered into for the purpose of creating the

12-20
p.m.

[Sri G. Nagabhushanam] [25th July 1953]

same unity in Andhradesa and that was when we chose Kurnool as capital. On that occasion, all the parties in Andhradesa came to the conclusion that Kurnool should be the capital. It was decided by a majority that it should be the capital and as stated already by Mr. Viswanatham, it is out of Court. It should not have been discussed anew but the Speaker has given permission to discuss the question already disposed of. Madam, I submit, in the interests of Andhradesa we have chosen Kurnool as the capital and it must stand. If we make any change now, the reputation of the future Andhra Government will be at stake. The common man will not have any confidence in the State or in the decisions that we may take hereafter. Therefore, the decision we have already taken must stand so that Kurnool may be the capital in spite of any opposition. My Communist friends were suggesting that because Vijayavada was sponsored by them, we did not accept it. That is not the correct view. On the other hand, after due deliberation and taking into account all merits and demerits of the case, we decided that Kurnool should be the capital. Madam, Kurnool is also nearer to Coastal districts than any other place. It has abundant supply of water and there are large quantities of raw materials available there for construction of new capital. And then, it is not correct to say that Vijayavada has got all the amenities. There are very many difficulties with regard to Vijayavada if we locate our capital there. So taking all these merits and demerits into account, on June 5, we took a decision and I pray and request all hon. Members to support Kurnool."

* SRI T. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI :—" Madam, it is a fact that the Andhra legislators met and decided Kurnool as capital but the circumstances under which Kurnool was chosen are well known to many Members. I need not explain how the name of Kurnool was not placed before the people and how the people were not able to give their consent later to the decision taken at that meeting. The decision taken at the meeting in June is really not one which will better the conditions of the Andhras. Even now the Assembly can give its correct opinion whether the temporary capital of Andhra is to be located at Kurnool or at Vijayavada. Whatever place is chosen, people should subscribe to that view. Now the Members will give a different verdict if Mr. Sanjeeva Reddi, the President of the Andhra Congress, gives the Congress Members freedom of voting. Anyway, what I feel is that the people are giving the correct and considered view that Kurnool should not be the capital. They want that it should be at some other centrally situated place, even if it be for a period of two or three years. I am saying so because I know their mind. It is not only the Communists that want it at Vijayavada. Even others who do not belong to the Communist Party share the same view. Rightists hold the same view as the leftists in this respect. We who spoke in defence of Vijayavada, held several meeting which were attended by lakhs of people and they supported our proposition. What I say is that in the mind of Mr. Sanjeeva Reddi, the people's interests do not work. Only his self-interest and the interests of the party are predominant in his mind. They are responsible for this

25th July 1953] [Sri T. Lakshminarayana Reddi]

decision on Kurnool. So, his view does not reflect the public view or the right view. Even Pandit Nehru if left to himself will hold that Vijayavada is the proper place. He will not accept the decision of June 5. Of course, if people here bring pressure upon him he would say 'yes' to what they decide. Otherwise, he will agree with us. Therefore, the task before the Assembly is to see that right action is taken, that is, to choose Vijayavada as the capital. After the decision on Kurnool was taken we went to the people and put forth our view about Vijayavada and they acclaimed it. They supported it. The people are behind us. But what did Mr. Sanjeeva Reddi do? When he went to Anantapur, he did not address a meeting in a public place, but held the meeting in the District Board office where there was a small gathering of officials and non-officials. Therefore, Sir, Mr. Sanjeevi Reddi did not elicit the opinion of the people. With my experience during the last three months, I am led to believe that the people are not for Kurnool. It is said that Rayalaseema people must be satisfied under the Sree Bagh Pact. Rayalaseema has been suffering from famines for the past so many decades and they have been agitating for projects to get rid of the famines. Rayalaseema people must be satisfied with projects, but not with a capital. Even if some lakhs or crores of rupees are spent, Kurnool cannot be a good capital and it cannot provide accommodation even for two or three offices. (At this stage, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.) The desire of the Rayalaseema people is that their projects must be taken up. They have no quarrel with the people of Circars. The Circar people are not really the same old people who were led by self-interested leadership. When the people of Rayalaseema were suffering from famines, the Circar people came forward with money and foodstuffs. The people of Rayalaseema are sure that, even if the capital is located at Vijayavada, the Circar people will do justice. I therefore earnestly appeal to the Members of all political parties to accept the location of capital at Vijayavada and High Court at Anantapur and see that the projects in Rayalaseema are taken up for execution early. What the Centre gives is only a few lakhs of rupees and it is not enough to construct a good capital. I therefore request the House to accept the amendment."

12-30
p.m.

SRI M. BAPAI AH CHOWDARY :—" Mr. Speaker, it is said by many hon. Members that this question was discussed at length by the Andhra Members of the Madras Legislature for a span of five days and that the merits and demerits of each city or town in Andhra was also discussed at length. I am not going to speak on the merits or the demerits of each city or town in Andhra. But I want to refer to the opinion of the public which was not available at the time when we last met. As you know, Sir, Kurnool was selected overnight and agitation for it was only during that period of five days. Now, Sir, after that decision was taken, hon. Members feel, after they have gone to their constituencies and to their villages, that the pulse of the people is not for Kurnool. Even Mr. Latchanna who fought like a lion for the proposition of Kurnool—though Mr. Thimma Reddi confined himself to arguing on matters like crime,

[Sri M. Bapaiah Chowdary] [25th July 1953]

etc., and the hon. Member who now sponsored the idea of Visakhapatnam as the temporary capital, feel that the pulse of the people is not for Kurnool. Therefore, Mr. Latchanna thinks that the decision must be changed, but at the same time he wants to respect the Sree Bagh Pact also. Sir, I do not want to go at length into the Sree Bagh Pact. But, one thing is clear that he too has to feel the pulse of the people. The selection of Kurnool has created an agitation in Andhra. The very fact that the Krishak Lok Party which fought for Kurnool at that time, now thinks after two months that Tirupati or Visakhapatnam should be the capital, supports the view that the people of Andhra are not happy over the selection of Kurnool. Another point is, immediately it was made known that Kurnool was to be the capital, the Press began to publish the views of the people and even then hon. Members did not come into direct contact with the voters and elicit their opinion. As one newspaper put it, hon. Members are able to sit here by the franchise of the public. When the people in one voice said that Kurnool was not to their taste, hon. Members should have felt that party dictation should not come in their way. If we are abiding our party dictation, it is due to the fact that we are elected to the Assembly and if people do not want it, we have to face another election. It being so, what is the idea in saying that one is abiding by the party decision. The Congress Members who want to abide by the party decision must know that the people who elected them do not accept the decision of Kurnool. That aspect also has to be taken into consideration.

“Then, Sir, the Hon. Sri Pattabhi Rama Rao said. ‘I want efficiency’ and it was reaffirmed many a time by the Hon. Chief Minister. When we are sending the services to Kurnool, what is the efficiency we can expect from them? Even the Hon. Sri Sankara Reddi speaking in another place yesterday said, ‘we cannot accommodate the gazetted officers; we can accommodate some clerical staff’. When a Minister feels that no accommodation can be given to the gazetted officers, what is the efficiency we can expect of them if we want them to live in huts or some hutments as we had in war time? Even considering the question of personnel or efficiency, we have to change our decision of Kurnool.

“Sir, the Government have sent their own Secretary to find out the accommodation in Kurnool. The Secretary, Mr. Lobo Prabhu, has reported that there is no construction of houses on this side of the century and all the buildings that are there were constructed on the other side of the century. We have to consider the financial aspect also. When we are going to spend some crores of rupees on Kurnool town, we should also consider whether there is any city or town which can accommodate all the offices and staff without spending any amount. We can ascertain this by sending Secretaries of Government to Vijayavada or Guntur, whether we can get sufficient accommodation in Guntur or Vijayavada to locate all the offices.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The hon. Member's time is up. Now, Mr. K. Venkatanarayana Dora will speak.”

25th July 1953]

SRI K. VENKATANARAYANA DORA :—

అధ్యక్షా, ఈ విశాఖపట్టణమును గురించి నేను ప్రతిపాదించిన ఈ సవరణను ఆంధ్ర దేశము వాతావరణములో వచ్చిన సంచలనము వృత్తాకారంలో విమన్నా ఆడ్డగేడనే దృష్టితోనే నేను తీసుకొచ్చాను. ఎందుకంటే, దేశము మొత్తముమీద రాయలసీమలో శ్రీబాగు ఒడంబడికను మన్నించింది శ్రీకాకుళం, విశాఖపట్టణము జిల్లాలవారే. కారణము, రాయలసీమ వారికంటే మేము వెనుకబడ్డవారము. రాయలసీమవారితో చేసుకున్న శ్రీ బాగు ఒడంబడికను దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని కృష్ణ లోక్ పార్టీ, స్వతంత్రులు, కాంగ్రెసు నాయకులయొక్క వత్తిడి వల్లనే గత జూన్ 5 వ తేదీనాడు రాయలసీమలో తాత్కాలిక రాజధాని ఏర్పాటుకుగాను కర్నూలు పట్టణాన్ని ఒప్పుకున్నామనిస్తే, అయితే ఈ నిర్ణయం ప్రజాభిప్రాయానికి పూర్తిగా వ్యతిరేకంగా ఉన్నదని ఆంధ్ర ప్రదేశ్ కాంగ్రెసు సహాయ కార్యదర్శి బెండి కూర్చినవారు ఈమధ్య జరిగిన టెక్కులి మహాసభలోగూడా ప్రకటించారు. ఈ కర్నూలు నిర్ణయముతో ఆంధ్ర దేశములో సంచలనము ఏర్పడినది. ప్రజలు వ్యతికలు దుయ్యబట్టడం జరిగింది. కర్నూలు నిర్ణయం ఈ కారణంచేత యిప్పుడు మార్చవలసియిస్తుంది. ఇది ప్రజాభిప్రాయానికి పూర్తిగా వ్యతిరేకమని తేలిపోయింది. ఈ సంచలనం పరిష్కరించటానికి కర్నూలు నిర్ణయం మార్చితేనే తప్ప వేరు మార్గంలేదు. ఆ కారణము చేతనే నేను ఈసవరణను తెచ్చాను. కర్నూలు తీర్మానము మొదలు ఆన్సి ఎమెండుమెంటు ఉపసంహరించుకొని, కానీ, గూడా ఖర్చుకాని వివాదగ్రస్తము కాని పట్టణము విశాఖపట్టణము తప్ప మరేటిలేదు. ఆంధ్ర దేశములో చిరస్థాయిగా నుండిన ప్రభుత్వం నెలకొల్పింతు తాత్కాలిక రాజధానిని కర్నూలుకు బదులు విశాఖపట్టణములో ఏర్పాటు చేయాలి. కర్నూలు నిర్ణయానికి కారణభూతులయినటువంటిన్ని, కురుపాండవ యుద్ధానికి కారణభూతులైన కురువృద్ధులు ముఖ్యమంత్రి శ్రీమాన్ రాజగోపాలాచార్యులు గారున్నూ, జనాభారముతో మృగమృగములువంటిన్ని, అస్త్రశస్త్రాలు చేతబూని కూర్చున్న శ్రీ ప్రకాశం పంతులుగారున్నూ తప్ప మరెవ్వరూ లేరు. వారు ధర్మమును నిర్ణయించునప్పుడు, వారు చేసినది ధర్మమేనా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. వారు ఈ తాత్కాలిక రాజధానిని నిర్ణయించడంలో ధర్మము, న్యాయము చేయకపోతే ధర్మము చేయనివారు అవుతారు. కర్నూలును తాత్కాలిక రాజధానిగా నిర్ణయించిన తర్వాత ఆంధ్ర దేశములో వాదోపవాదాలు, బేధ విభేదాలు, భిన్నాభిన్న వాదాలు తెచ్చుకొని ఒకరి పంథాను మరొకరు విమర్శించుకుంటున్నారు. యీ తాత్కాలిక రాజధాని తగాదా యిప్పుడు పరిష్కరించబడవలసి యున్నది. ఈ విభేదాలు అన్నియు పరిష్కరించుకొని రాజోపు అక్టోబరు ఒకటవ తేదీలోనా గవర్నరు, గవర్నరు పరివారము, ప్రభుత్వ కార్యదర్శులు, ఐ.సి.ఎస్.ఆఫీసర్లు, ప్రభుత్వ సిబ్బంది, ప్రభుత్వ రికార్డులతో సహా యిక్కడినుంచి తరలిపోవలసి యున్నది. ఈ తగాదాకు పరిష్కార మార్గము కర్నూలులో తాత్కాలికముగాగూడా వసతులు లేనికారణముచేత అన్నిటికి సౌకర్యాలు కలిగిన విశాఖపట్టణమును నిర్ణయించుట సమంజసమని అంటున్నాను. నాయకులైనవారు ఈ కర్నూలు నిర్ణయం మార్చుకోవలసినది విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. విశాఖపట్టణమునకు రెండు విరోడ్రోము లున్నాయి. ఒకటి బాడంగిలోనూ, మరొకటి విశాఖపట్టణములోనూ ఉన్నవి. భాషా ప్రయక్త రాష్ట్రాలు ఏర్పడినప్పుడు, ఒకటి ఒక వర్గము వారున్నూ, మరొకటి మరొక వర్గము వారున్నూ ఉపయోగించుకోవచ్చును. విదేశీయులు వ్యాపారస్తులు ఓగటానికి అనుకూలమైనచోలు. విశాఖపట్టణము చక్కని వ్యాపార కేంద్రం అని అందరికీ తెలిసిన విషయమే. ఇది ఎవ్వరు కాదనలేదు. ఇక్కడ రెండు విరోడ్రోములుండడమువలన విదేశ వ్యాపారస్తులకు అనువైనచోలు అని చెప్పక తప్పదు. ఓడరేలు కూడ కలిగిన ప్రదేశము.

[Sri K. Venkatanarayana Dora] [25th July 1953]

ఆంధ్ర దేశములో యింతటి వోడరేవు మరెక్కడనూ లేదు. విదేశ వాకలు ఏ వస్తువులున్నా వరి ఏ భాషారాష్ట్రములోనూగూడా దింప నక్కరలేదు. విశాఖపట్టణము రేవు ఆనేక దేశములకు కూడలి. ఆవ మహల్, చెముడు బిల్లింగు, బొబ్బిలి విజయగిరిములు, కళింగోటనుంచి భీమునిపట్టణము వరకూ బిల్లి గులు ఉన్నవి. ఆంధ్ర ప్రభుత్వ సిబ్బందికి కావలసిన ఖననాలు ఉన్నవి. విశాఖపట్టణమునకు సమీపములో వున్న కోరుకొండలో ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్ర గవర్నరు, గవర్నరు పరివారము ఉండవచ్చును. విశాఖపట్టణములో మదరాసులోవున్న ముఖ్యమైన ఆఫీసులు అన్నియు పెట్టుకోవచ్చును. పోలీసు యిన్స్పెక్టరు జనరల్ ఆఫీసు, రివిన్యూబోర్డు ఆఫీసు, కళింగోటలోగాని మరెక్కడనైనా గాని పెట్టుకోవచ్చును. ఎక్కడ చూచినా ప్రభుత్వానికి కావలసిన బిల్లింగులు ఉన్నవి. పి.డబ్ల్యు.డి. శైక్రేరియట్ ఆఫీసు భీముని పట్టణములో పెట్టవచ్చును. విపత్తణమున కైననూ రహదారులు బాగాఉన్నవి. పి.డబ్ల్యు.డి. సిబ్బందికి తగినన్ని కుటుంబాలకు వసతులు ఏర్పాటు చేసుకోవచ్చును. ప్రస్తుతము కోటి రూపాయలు మిగిలించుకోవచ్చును. మరొక జిల్లాకు తరలించనక్కరలేదు. నేను యీ విశాఖపట్టణమును గురించి యింకను ఎంతో భోగటా చెప్పవలసియున్నది. మరొక రెండు నిమిషాలైనను టైము యివ్వండి.

“ఈ విశాఖపట్టణము విషయములో ముఖ్యంగా మనవిచేసేది ఏమిటంటే, ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రముయొక్క శ్రేయస్సు మన ఆంధ్ర నాయకులు నిజంగా కోరుతున్నారంటే, తాత్కాలిక రాజధానికి తగిన వసతులు కలిగిన పట్టణము విశాఖపట్టణము తప్ప మరొక కేంద్రం లేదు, అని చెబుతున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వ సిబ్బంది గూడా కర్నూలు వెళ్లటానికి యిష్టపడడము లేదు. — ఈ శైక్రేరియట్ ఉద్యోగస్థులు కొందరు నాతో కర్నూలు రాజధానికి పోయి ఉద్యోగము చేసుకొనేదానికన్న ఉద్యోగాలు వనులుకొని చుట్టూ, ఓడి, సిగరట్, కిల్లి వగైరా ఆముగొని జీవిస్తామంటున్నారు. ఐ.సి.ఎస్. ఉద్యోగస్తులు ఎవ్వరినీ సంతృప్తికరముగ లేదంటూ అసంతృప్తిని తెలుపుతున్నారు. ప్రజలకు, ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాంగానికి ఆధారభూతులైన సిబ్బందికి, ఉద్యోగస్తులకు వ్యతిరేకమైన యీ కర్నూలు నిర్ణయం చూర్చి, విశాఖపట్టణమును తాత్కాలిక రాజధానిగా చేయాలని నా విజ్ఞప్తి. కర్నూలుకంటే విశాఖపట్టణపు శీతోష్ణస్థితి బాగా ఉంటుంది. కాబట్టి ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రముయొక్క శ్రేయస్సే గనుక యీ ఆంధ్ర నాయకులు కోరుతున్నట్లయితే, ప్రధానంగాను, న్యాయసమ్మతంగానూ, ధర్మసమ్మతమైనటువంటి నిర్ణయానికి రావాలంటే ఎక్కడ యిబ్బందులు గల కర్నూలు నిర్ణయం చూర్చుకొని విశాఖపట్టణమును తాత్కాలిక రాజధానిగా నిర్ణయించడమే ఉత్తమమని చెబుతున్నాను. రెండు ఏరిడ్రోములు, హార్బరులే కాకుండా, హాస్పిటల్ సౌకర్యము మంచి శీతోష్ణస్థితిగల రాజధానికి అనువైన చోటు ఈ విశాఖపట్టణము. నిజానీతులు గలిగినటువంటి జస్టిసు వాంఛాగారు కూడా ధర్మంగాను, న్యాయంగాను ఆలోచించి, ఆంధ్రులకు గౌరవముగల ప్రదేశం విశాఖ పట్టణమేనని గూడా వారి నివేదికలో సూచించిన విషయం అందరికీ తెలిసినదే. దీనిని ఎవ్వరునూ కాదనలేరు. ఆంధ్ర నాయకులెల్లరు ఈ ముఖ్యవిషయం గుర్తించాలి. అధ్యక్షులు రాజేంద్ర బాబు, భారత ప్రధాని ఆయిన పండిట్ జవహర్ లాల్, కేంద్ర విద్యా మంత్రి ఆబుల్ కలాము ఆజాదుగార్లకు ఈ నిర్ణయము వదలండి; అన్ని తీర్మానాలు, ఉపన్యాసాలు ఉపసంహరించుకొని విశాఖపట్టణమును తాత్కాలిక రాజధానిగా ఏర్పరచటానికి ఓటుచేయండి అని నేను విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తూ విరమిస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI N. V. RAMA RAO :—“ Sir, it is my strong conviction that the question of selecting a capital should not be on the basis of party issues. That is why I opposed the Kurnool decision last

25th July 1953] [Sri N. V. Rama Rao]

time in the party meeting. But I did not oppose that Kurnool resolution in the Andhra legislators' meeting held here in this Assembly hall, for choosing the temporary capital of Andhra. That was my grave mistake. So I request you not to attribute my views to any party. The Andhra legislators have taken a decision already on the question of selecting a temporary capital for Andhra. I do not know whether the Central Government is going to accept or change that decision when we send now the decision of this Madras Legislative Assembly regarding the capital of Andhra. But the amendments are there. And a vote will be taken, I suppose. I wish to express my own opinions regarding the amendments. The Central Government asked the Andhra legislators to meet and decide the question of temporary capital, mind you, not permanent capital. I believe most of the Andhra M.L.As. have not understood the significance of the word 'temporary', before the word 'capital'. That is the result of the last meeting of the Andhra legislators. Kurnool was chosen as the temporary capital of Andhra. Let hon. Members understand that we are not going to construct a permanent capital from October 1, but we must go to run the Government from October 1 from a place which can accommodate all Government Headquarter offices. The temporary capital must be within the easy reach of all the people in Andhra State and must give maximum accommodation with minimum expenditure. In my view, therefore, there are only two places in the whole of Andhradesa fit for a temporary capital. They are Vizag and Vijayavada to Guntur. But there comes the question of Sri Bagh Pact. Nearly twenty days before the selection of Kurnool, Sri Kala Venkata Rao issued a statement to the effect that the conditions of Sri Bagh Pact do not apply to the temporary capital and the conditions apply only to a permanent capital. I honestly feel he is correct in this regard. But most of the Rayalaseema M.L.As. are dogmatic in demanding even temporary capital for Rayalaseema. There are many people in Rayalaseema who do not like to have capital in Rayalaseema either temporary or permanent. They mainly want irrigation projects to save themselves from frequent famines. There are three signatories from Rayalaseema to Sri Bagh Pact. They are Sri Pappuri Ramachari, Sri Kalluri Subba Rao and Sri K. Koti Reddi. Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, who is a signatory on behalf of the Circar districts to Sri Bagh Pact, issued a statement to the effect that there is a specific clause in the Sri Bagh Pact stating that the terms of Sri Bagh Pact can be changed by common agreement. Apart from division of opinion among people as well as M.L.As. from Rayalaseema, the signatories of Rayalaseema to Sri Bagh Pact, excepting Sri Koti Reddi, do not want capital either temporarily or permanent for Rayalaseema. In April last Sri Kalluri Subba Rao spoke in a public meeting presided over by Sri Sanjeevi Reddi that Vijayavada, the heart of Andhradesa, should become capital of future Andhra State. Sri Pappuri Ramachari issued statement after statement that the demand for capital in Rayalaseema is unjust and unwise and Vijayavada should be the natural capital of Andhra State.

[Sri N. V. Rama Rao]

[25th July 1953]

Among the three signatories of Rayalaseema, two have vehemently opposed the demand for capital in Rayalaseema. The third signatory from Rayalaseema, Sri Koti Reddi, I trust, is not so dogmatic demanding even temporary capital for Rayalaseema.

"Where is the Sri Bagh Pact, I am asking, when the amendment of Sri Lachanna regarding the location of the Andhra High Court in the light of Sri Bagh Pact was defeated in this House the other day? Why was that amendment defeated if we honour Sri Bagh Pact? Sri T. Viswanatham, the proposer of Kurnool resolution, voted against that amendment regarding the seat of High Court in the light of Sri Bagh Pact. Why? And why some Members who supported Kurnool resolution voted against the same amendment? Perhaps the reasons are well known to themselves. Then what is the meaning of saying that they are honouring Sri Bagh Pact by selecting Kurnool as temporary capital for Andhra State?

"Sri Sanjeevi Reddi, the President of Andhra Provincial Congress Committee, and the leader of Andhra Congress Legislature Party, expressed the other day in the Party meeting that he personally likes Visakhapatnam to be the temporary capital. Many a time he expressed this view in his conversations. In this connexion I must say that Sri Sanjeevi Reddi has failed to do his duty as President of Andhra Provincial Congress Committee and as leader of Andhra Congress Legislature Party regarding the question of selecting temporary capital. He should have convened"

12-50
p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member's time is up. I want to put this question to the vote of the House at 1 o'clock. Sri Viswanatham will now speak."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member who preceded me asked why I had voted against the amendment favouring the location of the High Court somewhere in Rayalaseema in the light of the Sri Bagh Pact. I am not sure, Sir, if you are aware of the provisions of the Sri Bagh Pact. One provision was that in the event of the formation of the Andhra State the people of the Circars who are in majority should give the right of choice of the capital to the Rayalaseema people who constitute a minority and they should be asked to exercise their choice whether they would like the capital or the High Court. At the 'informal' meeting, as you were pleased to call it which in fact was an official meeting, they exercised their choice in favour of the capital and having exercised the choice, the clause exhausted itself and that is the reason why we voted in that particular way.

"With regard to the question on hand, I wish to make only one submission. It is only one month ago that the decision has been arrived at. Sometimes it may happen in assemblies and congregations like this, we may take some decision which may not be

25th July 1953]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

entirely satisfactory. But all the same there must be some definiteness at least for some short period. I can understand if the Andhra legislators after the formation of the State and making the State a certainty reopened this question. The Prime Minister wanted the Andhra legislators to meet and give the name of a particular place which they will have for their capital; they were asked to meet and name their choice. The whole matter was official. We could have really saved the acrimony and bitterness had we been told by anybody in authority or by those who had the authority to tell us that whatever the decision that may be arrived at, it may be re-opened at a subsequent time before the State is formed and can be the subject-matter of further discussion. Why were we asked to meet and discuss the question paying us travelling and other allowances? The proceedings were officially recorded and printed and so much money and so much temper could have been saved had we been told that it is subject to further discussion. We could have sat in a calmer atmosphere if we had been told it was an informal meeting and that it is not binding upon anybody. As a matter of fact, the Government of Madras did not think it informal and the Government of India did not think so and therefore, they have introduced a clause saying that money lent for the purpose of buildings, etc., at Kurnool will be a liability of the Andhra Government. As men of commonsense, I appeal to hon. Members not to be keeping on rolling and changing their opinion from day to day because no Government could be carried on in that manner. I have nothing to offer for the proposal of my hon. Friend that the capital should be changed. I am not saying it could not be changed. It could be changed in proper time."

MR. SPEAKER :—"How are the Government responsible for this? "

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"I am not blaming anybody, Sir. The Hon. the Chief Minister having taken up a decision and included a provision in the Bill itself now says that he will remain neutral. I do not blame him either because situations are developing for him and others in such a manner that men who are parties to a particular decision now suddenly become obliged to become neutral. If there is good reason, all of us can change, there is no objection and there is no harm done by it. But the point is what is it that has happened during this one month, during this short space of time to upset everything? After all the State has not been formed. But there is time to choose a good capital and that should depend upon the vote of the House and at that time, we could have an inter-party meeting of the legislators and decide everything in a calm atmosphere. We could do it and there is time. I was, therefore, not prepared to take part in the discussions pertaining to the capital because I thought it was a closed matter and it is not for us to rake up that question now but you were pleased to allow it, Sir. At this rate, even what we said to-day can be upset within a week and it will be like the waves of the seas during the south-west monsoon,

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [25th July 1953]

waves coming one after another, waves upon waves and cross-waves. I do not think that this quick-changing opinions like this will lead to anything good. But still, I do not blame anybody. But I would only submit one thing and that is that having taken a stand upon a particular matter on certain grounds only recently, I do not advise and I do not like my friends to change it so quickly for if a man changes his opinion so quickly he is likely to change once more more quickly and there will be no finality about it."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have nothing to say for the resolution that has been placed in my name. I have spoken upon that question quite a lot and I have expressed myself freely and Members know it. There is one thing which I want hon. Members to remember. After having passed the resolution at the informal meeting of the Andhra legislators, there is only one change that has occurred. After that, we have gone to the people, we have explained to the people and have ascertained their opinion in the matter and we have also had a report from the Government itself as to the possibilities of Kurnool as a capital of the Andhra State. So, having made a wrong decision a decision which had not the approval of the people and which will entail a great amount of expenditure for the new State which it cannot afford to bear, it is just now the time for the legislators to think over the matter very calmly and carefully and come to a decision which would increase the wealth of the State, which would reduce our own immediate expenditure and would reduce our commitments by way of the loan which we have to take for constructing a new capital when such amounts are required for constructing irrigation projects for increasing the wealth of country. At such a time as this when we require funds for constructing irrigation works to increase production and the wealth of the State, I cannot imagine how we can go on constructing buildings in Kurnool because without having any such construction, it would be impossible for us to house the offices and the staff. There is not a single building where offices could be accommodated and all these have to be put up at considerable cost which the State cannot afford to do having regard to our immediate needs. Having in mind the future development of our city and of our present difficulties in selecting the particular place, we have to make a decision and any decision that we have taken must be reviewed and reconsidered in the light of these things. We have to carry the people with us in what we do, we have to increase the trade in our State, we have to increase the wealth of our State and of our country and that is why in conformity with the wishes of the people we say that Vijayavada should be named as the capital because it is centrally located, is sufficiently developed, does not require a loan to be developed with, it is capable of increasing the wealth of the people and hence I would request the Andhra legislators to change over to Vijayavada and at least now correct the decision which has been taken, and take a decision which will be accepted by the people and appreciated by future generation."

25th July 1953]

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Andhras are 1 p.m. called upon to carve out a State for themselves. They have undertaken it and they have to do their duty. All the formalities have been gone through. A full debate was carried on and the Andhra legislators arrived at a particular decision. That decision was the result of the anxiety on the part of the Andhra legislators to see that a real Andhra State was formed—not a State consisting of the coastal districts alone, not a State consisting of only the Rayalaseema area. This proposed Andhra State consists of twelve or thirteen districts—six districts extending on the coastal side and six districts on the west called ‘Rayalaseema’. For twenty-five years or more, whenever the question of the separation of the Andhra Province was considered, the Rayalaseema friends were protesting against its formation stating their own grievances and ultimately they got the Sri Bagh Pact. I am not an orthodox man who would feel bound by orthodox views. Here a new State has to be formed. For twenty-five long years our Rayalaseema friends were preventing the formation of an Andhra State. What is it that we should do now? Are we to form an Andhra State, or are we to form a coastal State or are we to form only a Rayalaseema State? I have known every inch of the whole of the Andhra State myself. I know Kurnool, Visakhapatnam, Vijayavada and Guntur also. I belong to more than one district by way of birth or adoption or any one of these things. Therefore, it was not out of any partiality or any love or any particular reason that Kurnool was chosen. Four districts constitute Rayalaseema on the west and a choice was given to them under the Sri Bagh Pact. Whether I am an orthodox man who is bound by the Sri Bagh Pact or not, how are we to start this new State? Are we to start it on a real, true and honest foundation or simply make some show? With all deference to my friends who have been talking of Vijayavada or Guntur and other places, I wish to say that it would have been a total failure if our Rayalaseema friends had not co-operated with us and if this State has not been formed in the manner in which it is being formed now, there would have been no Andhra State at all. We would have broken up long long ago and we have been anxious to pull together without any difference of opinion and form a State. That is why we have come to this stage. Now I wonder how some of my friends thought it fit to bring in a resolution here stating that Tirupati should be the temporary capital and not Kurnool. It passes my comprehension, Sir. What is it that we are doing now? Is this the way in which we should be conducting our business here? Is this the way in which we should form the State? If this is the basis on which we are going to form the State, what is the foundation? The foundation is untruth and unreality. If we leave out the whole of Rayalaseema and deal only with the coastal districts, the whole thing will turn to be an unreal business. Therefore, it is not fair and proper on the part of my friends to have tabled a resolution like this. Now, why should we shift the capital to Tirupati? Tirupati was not accepted even informally at the meeting of the legislators and why should it have been brought now? What

[Sri T. Prakasam]

[25th July 1953]

is our business? Are we really building up a State? I feel that we are not building up a State. On the other hand, we are undermining the foundations of the real basis for establishing the new State. I am sorry I am obliged to say all this. We want to avoid all personal references or sectional differences or party considerations. It was pointed out that Vijayavada is the centre of the Communist Party and all work is being done there. What is there in Vijayavada? No doubt, Sir, ever since this question of the formation of the Andhra State was raised, some persons have invested large sums of money in purchasing properties either in Vijayavada or in some other places hoping that the capital would go there. But when the capital did not go there, naturally they got upset. (Laughter.) I am sorry I have to say all this on the floor of this House though I wanted to avoid all such personal controversies. So far as Vijayavada is concerned, Sir, it is practically my own place. Guntur is a district in which I was born. I claim Guntur to be my own. So far as Vijayavada is concerned, I have no particular hatred."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"You are taking my birth place!" (Laughter.)

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—"The hon. the Chief Minister says that I am taking his birth-place! We have not come to Hosur! (Laughter.) So, Sir, I am telling you what I have known in the last few years, not to talk of the long range of period. From what I have known, I cannot give a free certificate either for Vijayavada or for even Guntur for the matter of that. But that was not the consideration at all. Vijayavada or Guntur was left out because we accepted the Sri Bagh Pact which gave the choice of capital or the seat of High Court to our Rayalaseema friends. They chose the capital and chose Kurnool and we accepted it. This is the truth. There must be honesty among ourselves. We are governed by majority rule in this country. If we do not have majority rule, you, Mr. Speaker, will not be able to preside over this House even for one day. Such a sacred rule has been adopted and put into force not only by us, but also in every other country in the world. Even in countries where law and order does not prevail but only disorder prevails, majority rule was adhered to ultimately. Are we to break that now? We ought not to resort to the method of over-reaching one another like lawyers. Among ourselves, there were so many groups. We have managed to bring all these groups together and composed our differences as this is necessary for forming the Andhra State which we are called upon to do. Under these circumstances, I am very sorry to say publicly that we have become disorderly persons. Have we really become disorderly? No. I have been living in the hope that disorder will make room for order. We have succeeded in it to some extent in some places; we have failed to a great extent in other places. This is the first time that we are making an attempt to form the Andhra State. We would have formed the object of ridicule all over the world if we had not been able to come to an

25th July 1953]

[Sri T. Prakasam]

agreement on the question of a temporary capital for the State that is to be formed. We would have been ridiculed, disgraced and dishonoured. Such a thing I would not allow to come to pass. We are working together for a particular purpose. Therefore I appeal to my friends to withdraw their amendments.

“ Shall I tell Mr. Venkateswarlu about Vijayavada? Vijayavada has been the centre of great events. Even to-day it is the centre of great events. I may tell you, Sir, and through you to the hon. Members that there are areas between Vijayavada and Guntur wherein in broad daylight robberies and dacoities were committed, iron safes were forcibly opened and currency notes worth thousands and thousands of rupees were taken away. In one house after opening the iron safe and taking away the money, the owner was asked to stand on the veranda and there he was shot dead. (An hon. Member: ‘ Who did these things? ’) My friend wants me to say who did all these things. They were known persons. They did not come in the night. They came in broad daylight, they came in uniforms and they did these things. The same set of persons went to the next house and the house next to that and repeated this atrocity. The owners of both these houses were tied hand to hand and shot dead together. I am stating facts which were put in the possession of Sri Jawaharlal Nehru and the late Sardar Vallabhai Patel. However, those facts did not weigh with us.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI: (seeing an hon. Member of the Communist Party rising on a point of order):—
“ The hon. Member is rising on a point of order.”

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—“ The Chief Minister is a very clever man; very able man. He can manage so many things simultaneously. He was trying to manage me on the one hand and my friend who wants to raise a point of order on the other. What is the point of order? We have had points of order as between the Chief Minister and other friends.

“ I am stating hard facts which are on record, and the record is in the hands of the highest persons. Andhra State would not have come to this pass if certain mistakes had not been committed by the Central Government and by those who were responsible for it. We were neglected in every sense and we were forcibly driven out of Madras. We were told that we could not have the capital in Madras City. We have accepted that position. My friends who have raised this question should bear in mind the history of the Andhra people during the last four or five years at least, if not the history of the earlier period. You (referring to the Members who moved the amendments) and I, who are supposed to be representatives or leaders, are not suffering. But the people who are suffering are outside. This country has been brought to a stage at which food and cloth are not available to the common people. Maladministration went on to such an extent that no effort on our part could be successful in putting it

[Sri T. Prakasam]

[25th July 1953]

down. At last we have come to this position and we wanted to break off against our own will. Even if we break off, I say we are together. At this time what is it, Sir, that we are going to lose whether the temporary capital is at Kurnool or Visakhapatnam? Visakhapatnam is no doubt an ideal place to some. It is not an ideal place to me. Because some buildings and houses are available in Visakhapatnam, it is said that we should go there. We have gone to Visakhapatnam taking the Andhra University. The country has suffered since then on account of the distance of the Andhra University. This time we have gone to the other extreme. Because I said in a debate in this House that we had gone to a jungle place, that is taken hold of by a learned editor of this Madras City.

1-20
p.m.

“He was making a point of it saying ‘Mr. Prakasam himself has gone to a jungle place—aranyam’. That place is jungle for us. Sir, if there is really any happy place for any of us, there is no place like Kurnool. Therefore, I am submitting through you to all my friends to forget their differences and not to carry things any further and not to break this decision regarding Kurnool. The Kurnool decision may be broken just as my friends pointed out that some statue was broken somewhere. This was pointed out during the five-day session here. Because a statue was broken, they thought I would be frightened. (Laughter.) I saw many statues broken not only in this country of ours but elsewhere. In that Great Germany at the two cross roads running for 10 or 15 miles, all along the roads, on mounted horses the statues of Kaiser were installed. That was the only thing that a visitor could see in those days. What happened to those statues? Is there any trace of any statue in Germany to-day? Where is Germany to-day. How Germany has been reduced . . .”

(The hon. Member had not concluded his speech when the Speaker rang the Bell. The hon. Member then resumed his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER:—“We have got only ten minutes more. I will put the amendment of Mr. Latchanna to vote first. If that is carried, I would not put other amendments to vote.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—“Sir, before my amendment is put to vote, please allow me to say only two words. నా సవరణను జోబుకు పెట్టేముందు రెండు మాటలు చెప్పవలచుకొన్నాను.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—“He is withdrawing his amendment, Sir.” (Laughter.)

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—“It is Mr. Vinayakam's opinion, Sir. It is very difficult for me to express my opinion in English. So, please allow me to say a few words in Telugu.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“Mr. Vinayakam says that the hon. Member is withdrawing his amendment.”

25th July 1953]

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—" It is his opinion, Sir."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" I do not follow his Telugu, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I now put Mr. Latchanna's amendment No. 224 to vote. The question is—

' This Assembly recommends that for the word " Kurnool " occurring in paragraph 12 (2), the following words shall be substituted :—

" Tirupati or any other place in Chittoor district which may be more conveniently situated in matters deemed to be essential for the Capital of State and with easy communications with the Northern Circars." "

The amendment was put and declared lost.

Sri G. Latchanna demanded a poll.

The Hon. Speaker asked the Members who were in favour of the amendment and against it to stand alternatively in their places. As only thirteen members stood in favour of the amendment and more than that number stood against it, poll was refused. The amendment was declared lost.

The following amendment of Mr. T. Nagi Reddi (Amendment No. 226) was put and lost :—

' 226. This Assembly is of the opinion that the Capital of the Andhra State be located in Vijayavada.' "

The following amendment of Sri K. Venkatanarayana Dora (No. 231) was put to the House and declared lost :—

' This Assembly recommends that for the word " Kurnool " in sub-paragraph (2) of paragraph 12, the word " Visakhapatnam " shall be substituted.'

Sri K. Venkatanarayana Dora demanded a poll.

The Hon. Speaker asked those Members who were in favour of Mr. Venkatanarayana Dora's amendment and against it to stand alternatively in their places.

As only sixteen Members stood in their places in support of the amendment, and more than that number stood against it, poll was refused and the amendment of Mr. Venkatanarayana Dora was declared lost.

The following amendment No. 235 (1) of Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah was put to the House and declared lost :—

' For the word " Kurnool ", substitute the words " Guntur to Vijayavada ".'

[25th July 1953]

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :

Ayes—62.

1-30
p.m.

Sri G. Anjaneyulu.
 „ K. Appala Naidu.
 „ M. Bapaiah Chowdary.
 „ G. Bapanayya.
 „ P. Bapu Naidu.
 „ Chandra Ramalingaiah.
 „ B. Gangayya Naidu.
 „ Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah.
 „ K. Govinda Rao.
 „ M. Hanumantha Rao.
 „ G. Joseph.
 „ S. Kasireddy.
 „ G. C. Kondayya.
 „ P. Kotajiah.
 „ K. Krishna Rao.
 „ M. Kune Rao.
 „ Lakshminarayana Reddi.
 „ M. Lakshmanaswamy.
 „ D. Lakshmayya.
 „ B. Lakshminarasa Raju.
 „ K. Malakondayya.
 „ G. Nageswara Rao.
 „ T. Nagi Reddi.
 „ N. V. L. Narasimha Rao.
 „ P. Narasimha Reddi.
 „ Kavali Narayana.
 „ M. Narayanasamy.
 „ Asi Neeladrirao Reddi.
 „ M. Pentannaidu.
 „ T. Potha Raju.
 „ C. Prabakara Choudary.

Sri C. Pulla Reddi.
 „ P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
 „ K. Rajagopala Rao.
 „ P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
 „ G. Rama Rao.
 „ N. V. Rama Rao.
 „ P. Rama Rao.
 „ V. Rama Rao.
 „ K. Ramiah Choudary.
 „ K. Ranga Rao.
 „ B. Sankarayya.
 „ G. Satyanarayana.
 „ D. Seetharamiah.
 „ R. Siddanna Gowd.
 „ N. Sivarami Reddy.
 „ V. Sri Krishna.
 „ B. Subba Raju.
 „ K. Subba Reddi.
 „ P. Suryachandrarao.
 „ P. Shyamasundra Rao.
 „ M. Veerabhadram.
 „ S. Vemiah.
 „ K. Venkaiah.
 „ C. V. K. Rao.
 „ R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
 „ Saka Venkata Rao.
 „ Alluri Venkataramaraju.
 „ P. Venkatasiviah.
 „ Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.
 „ K. Venkatnarayana Dora.
 „ G. Yellamanda Reddi.

Noes—63.

Sri K. Adikesavulu Naidu.
 „ S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.
 „ A. Appu.
 „ T. C. Atchannaaidu.
 „ Y. Audinarayana Reddi.
 „ K. Balanarayana Reddi.
 „ D. Basivi Reddi.
 „ N. Chenchurama Naidu.
 „ V. Chidanandam.
 „ P. Chinna Reddi.
 „ V. C. Chudamani Deo.
 „ P. V. R. Gajapathi Raju (Raja of Vizianagaram).
 „ P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.
 „ P. Gunnayya.
 „ K. Koti Reddi.
 „ Srimalathi Thamma Kotamma Reddi.
 „ Sri B. Krishnamurthy Rao.
 „ Kunhi Muhamed Shafee.
 „ L. Lakshmana Das.
 „ R. Lakshmi Narasimham Dora.
 „ T. Mallayya.
 „ M. Muni Reddi.
 „ Ch. S. R. V. P. Murthy Raju.
 „ G. Nagabhushanam.
 „ S. Narayanappa.
 „ K. V. S. Padmanabha Raju.
 „ T. Prakasam.
 „ N. Ramabhadra Raju.
 „ D. Ramabrahmam.
 „ B. Ramakrishna Reddi.
 „ H. Ramalinga Reddi.

Sri K. Ramamurthy.
 „ K. V. Ramesam.
 „ A. Rami Reddi.
 „ K. Ramiah.
 „ P. Ranga Reddi.
 „ P. Sangam Naidu.
 „ The Hon. Sri D. Sanjivayya.
 „ N. Sankara Reddi.
 „ Sri K. Santhappa.
 „ H. Satyanarayana Dora.
 „ P. Selvaraj.
 „ G. Sivasankara Reddi.
 „ M. Srungaram.
 „ M. Subba Reddi.
 „ C. Subbarayudu.
 „ R. B. V. Sudarsana Varma.
 „ K. Suryanarayana.
 „ Raja Sagi Suryanarayana Raju.
 „ G. Suryanarayana.
 „ P. Timma Reddi.
 „ K. Varadachari.
 „ K. Veeranna Padal.
 „ K. V. Vema Reddy.
 „ K. Venkata Kurmi Nayudu.
 „ K. Venkata Setty.
 „ M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ P. Venkatasubbayya.
 „ N. Venkatayya.
 „ A. Venkatramaiah.
 „ P. Venkatswami Reddi.
 „ T. Viswanatham.

25th July 1953]

Neutral—94.

- Sri A. Ayyanar.
 „ T. Anantha Pai.
 „ Anthony Peter.
 „ T. S. Ardhanari.
 „ S. R. Arumugam.
 „ R. S. Arumugam.
 „ V. Balakrishnan.
 „ K. H. Bomman.
 „ P. Chellathurai.
 „ O. Chengam Pillay.
 „ S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.
 „ S. Chinnathambi Thevar.
 „ V. Chinnayya.
 „ AR. A. R. M. Chokkalingam Chettiar.
 „ D. Dasarathan.
 „ M. Dharmalingam
 „ T. P. Elumalai.
 „ W. J. Fernandez.
 „ K. Gajapathi Reddy.
 „ T. Ganapathy.
 „ K. C. Gopalan Unni.
 „ G. Govindan.
 „ H. M. Jagannatham.
 „ M. Kalyanasundaram.
 „ C. H. Kanaran.
 „ P. G. Karuthiruman.
 „ Kattimuthu.
 „ S. S. Kolkebail.
 „ O. Koran.
 „ K. Kotra Basanna Goud.
 „ R. Krishnan.
 The Hon. Dr. U. Krishna Rao.
 Sri P. S. Krishnasamy Ayyangar.
 „ E. T. Kunhan.
 „ P. Kunhirama Kidav.
 „ R. Kuppaswami.
 „ The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nayar.
 Sri G. Latchanna.
 „ V. Madanagopal.
 „ K. Madhavan Nambiar.
 The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
 Sri P. G. Manikam.
 „ Y. Manjaya Shetty.
 Dr. K. B. Menon.
 Sri M. S. Munisami Pillay.
 „ P. M. Munnsamy Gownder.
 „ K. G. Munusamy Gounder.
 Raja M. A. Muthiah Chettiar.
 Sri C. Muthiah Pillai.
 „ V. Muthu.
 „ M. C. Muthukumaraswamy.
 „ T. D. Muthukumaraswamy Naidu.
 The Hon. Dr. R. Nagan Gouda.
 Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
 „ M. K. Padmaprabha Gounder.
 „ N. K. Palanisami.
 The Hon. Sri V. C. Palanisami Gounder.
 Sri V. K. Palanisami Gounder.
 „ S. Panchaksharam.
 „ S. Parameswarappa.
 „ C. Rajam Ramasami.
 „ K. Rajaram.
 „ K. T. Raju.
 „ M. R. Ramachandran.
 „ A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
 „ S. Ramalingam.
 „ V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
 „ N. Rathina Gounder.
 „ G. Samia Koorayar.
 „ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
 „ T. V. Sannasi.
 „ M. G. Shanker.
 „ T. Shanmugam.
 The Hon. Sri A. B. Shetty.
 Sri Sirasappa, Ijari
 „ N. Sivaraj.
 „ S. N. Somayajulu.
 Srimathi Dr. T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran.
 Sri K. T. Sridharan.
 „ A. S. Subbaraj.
 The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
 Sri I. K. Subramania Pillai.
 „ R. Thangavelu.
 „ Thiagaraja Pillay.
 „ S. Thinakarasaami Thevar.
 „ P. K. Thirumurthi.
 „ S. Vadivelu.
 „ Vaikuntam.
 „ O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ S. Venkatrama Ayyar.
 „ K. Venkatramana Gowda.
 The Hon. Sri K. Venkataswamy Naidu.
 Sri K. Vinayakam.
 „ S. C. Virupakshaiah.

Ayes 62; Noes 63; Neutral 94.

The amendment was lost.

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ May I know the number of non-Andhras who voted for the amendment? Is it about 6 or 4? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ It is not the duty of the Speaker to count how many non-Andhras voted for the amendment. ”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ What about re-count? I request you, Sir, if it is allowable . . . ”

[25th July 1953]

MR. SPEAKER :—" No, the result is final.

" The half-hour debate on the cancellation of teaching certificates scheduled to take place to-day is cancelled. The House will now adjourn and meet again at 8-30 a.m. on Monday, the 27th July 1953."

The House then adjourned.

